CHINA
AND
Educational Autonomy

ALICE H. GREGG

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 9 1947
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LC626
.C6G81

CHINA AND EDUCATIONAL AUTOMONY

CHINA AND EDUCATIONAL AUTONOMY

The Changing Role of the Protestant Educational Missionary in China, 1807-1937

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 3 1947
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

by
Alice H. Gregg

Member of the Diocese of Anking since 1916; Member of the Religious Education Deputation of 1930-31; Co-operating Secretary on the National Committee for Christian Religious Education in China since 1931; Honorary Secretary, National Christian Council of China, 1938-1941.

Syracuse University Press
Syracuse, New York
1946

Copyright 1946
Syracuse University Press

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

E'en then a wish, (I mind its pow'r)
A wish that to my latest hour
Shall strongly heave my breast:
That I, for puir auld Scotland's sake,
Some usefu' plan or book should make,
Or sing a song, at least.
ROBERT BURNS.

LOVE for China came on the day when, as a Language School student in Nanking, I listened to Dr. J. Leighton Stuart talk on Chinese civilization. Placing China alongside Greece and Rome and Judea, he said that as truly as the Greeks had a genius for beauty, or the Romans for law, or the Jews for religion, so truly had the Chinese a genius for morality. The man who had been elevated to the highest place, and who had put his stamp on millions of his fellow-countrymen throughout the centuries, was not a great warrior, or a great king, or a great lawgiver, but a great moral teacher, Confucius.

My gratitude for insight into Chinese civilization goes first to Dr. Stuart, and after him to many others, chiefly Chinese. I think especially of T. Z. Koo, whose influence reached me through his sister before I arrived in China; of the splendid group of Chinese clergy in the Anking diocese, two of whom are now bishops,–the Rt. Rev. P. Lindel Tsen, D.D., of Honan, and the Rt. Rev. Robin T. S. Chen, D.D., of Anking; of friend and colleague in the National Christian Council of China, Dr. Timothy Tingfang Lew, educator, legislator, and writer; of Dr. Frank Rawlinson, editor for a quarter-century of *The Chinese Recorder*, who was felled by shrapnel in the very beginning of the invasion by Japan, August 13, 1937.

My thanks are also due to those who advised, encouraged, made helpful suggestions, or who corrected errors in the work itself: Dr. L. Carrington Goodrich, Dr. John L. Childs, and Dr. Donald G. Tewksbury. For careful editing of the manuscript, I am indebted to Dr. F. Ernest Johnson and Miss Nettie Wysor.

Finally, my unbounded thanks are due Dr. Lucy W. Markley, librarian at Union Theological Seminary, for the use of a room, January, 1944 until June, 1945, where valuable manuscripts were kept under lock and key.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
JANUARY 28, 1946.

CONTENTS

PERIOD ONE 1807-1902

CHAPTER PAGE
I China and the Western Powers, 1807-1902 1
II Protestant Missionaries and Education, 1807-1902 11

PERIOD TWO 1902-1927

III Years of Brewing Revolution, 1902-1909 29
IV The Rise of a Missionary System of Education, 1902-1909 42
V Revolution and Renaissance, 1909-1919 65
VI Expansion and Reorganization of Missionary Education, 1909-1919 77
VII Christianity in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927 101
VIII Missionary Education in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927 114

PERIOD THREE 1927-1937

IX China under the Kuomintang, 1927-1937 143
X From Missionary to Chinese Christian Education, 1927-1937 155
XI Summary 193

PERIOD FOUR

XII China—A Forecast 207
APPENDIX A 213
APPENDIX B 215
BIBLIOGRAPHY 221
NOTES 229
INDEXES 267

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE PROTESTANT EDUCATIONAL MISSIONARY 1807-1937

PERIOD ONE 1807-1902

CHAPTER PAGE

I CHINA AND THE WESTERN POWERS, 1807-1902

China's Dynasties 1
International Relations 2
Social Change 4
Reform and Counter-Revolution 5
Education 6
  Traditional 6
  In transition 7
  Agitation for a national system 7
Entrance of Protestant Christians 8

II PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES AND EDUCATION, 1807-1902

Introduction 11
A Period of Individual Effort, 1807-1877 12
  Robert Morrison and the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca 12
  Charity or day schools 13
  The Morrison Educational Society 15
  Work on the mainland 15
  Trend away from educational work 18
A Period of Organized Effort, 1877-1902 18
  School and Textbook Series Committee 18
  The Educational Association of China (EAC) 20
  Higher education and the planting of Christianity 22
Missionaries and a National School System 22
  Missionary agitation for a national school system 22
  The EAC prepares to give China a national school system 24
  Disillusionment: China turns to Japan 25
Education: the Missionary's Special Field 28

PERIOD TWO 1902-1927

III YEARS OF BREWING REVOLUTION, 1902-1909

Growth of the Political Underground Movement 29
International Relations 31
Social Change 31

CHAPTER PAGE
Education: Rise of the Government Schools 33
The Christian Community 38

IV THE RISE OF A MISSIONARY SYSTEM OF EDUCATION, 1902-1909

Growth of Missionary Education, 1902-1909 42
The Launching of a Missionary System of Education 43
  The Fourth Triennial (1902) 43
  ✓ *The appeal to the Boards* 46
  ✓ *Dr. W. A. P. Martin and the appeal to the Boards* 47
The Issue of Government Recognition 48
  The Fifth Triennial (1905) and the Chinese government 48
  "Foreign schools" seek recognition 50
  The Government distinguishes between Chinese Christians and "foreign schools" 52
Educational Trends, 1902-1909 55
  Expansion of educational work 55
  United effort in educational work 56
  The rise of regional associations 59
  ✓ *The question of English* 59
  Trend away from the preparation of Chinese textbooks 59
  Romanization 60
Chinese Participation in Missionary Education 61
  Textbooks 61
  Status of the Chinese teacher 61

V REVOLUTION AND RENAISSANCE, 1909-1919

From Empire to Republic 65
Repercussions of World War I 67
Beginnings of Industrialization 68
The Renaissance or New Civilization Movement 69
Education 71
Changes in the Christian Community 74

VI EXPANSION AND REORGANIZATION OF MISSIONARY EDUCATION, 1909-1919

Expansion 77
Reorganization of the EAC 79
  Regional associations and the Advisory Council 79
  The change of name: China Christian Educational Association (CCEA) 81
  The Educational Review 81

CHAPTER PAGE
Chinese Participation in Missionary Education 82
  Chinese ask a share in Christian education 82
Method of Administration of the Association 84
  Missionary response to Chinese request 84
Government Recognition 86
  The Sixth Triennial and the Chinese government 86
  Dr. Fong F. Sec and government recognition 88
  Chinese Christian educationists and government recognition 90
  Little progress in securing government recognition 92
  Missionary views on government recognition 92
Questioning of the Missionary Role in Education 93
  Questioning of the missionary role in Education by Missionaries: Dr. D. L. Anderson 93
Questioning of the Missionary Role in Education by Chinese 96
The Patriotic Movement 99

VII CHRISTIANITY IN THE RISING TIDE OF NATIONALISM, 1919-1927

Merging of Renaissance and Patriotic Movements 101
The Anti-Religion Movement 103
Response of the Christian Community to the New Movements 105
Response of the Missionaries to the New Movements 109
The Kuomintang-Communist Rapprochement and Break ... 111

VIII MISSIONARY EDUCATION IN THE RISING TIDE OF NATIONALISM, 1919-1927

Mission Education *vis-a-vis* Government Education 114
Growing Antagonism toward Christian Schools 116
  Rationalism 116
  Nationalism 117
  Communism 120
Attempts to Make Christian Education Indigenous 121
  Handicaps of missionary education 121
  Visit of the China Educational Commission 122
  Regional associations and indigenization 123
  CCEA and Chinese leadership 125
  The college group and indigenization 126
Missionary Education under Attack 127
  First and second attacks, 1924 127

CHAPTER PAGE
  - *Editorial response* 128
  - *Christian schools under attack* 129
- Some Results of the Attacks 131
  - *A call for treaty revision* 131
  - *Listening to the non-Christian point of view* 132
  - *The improvement of religious education* 133
  - *Speeding up of devolution* 135
  - *Renewed negotiations with the government* 136
- Christian Schools and Government Recognition 137
  - *The Peking government issues terms for registration* 137
- Registration of Christian Schools 137
  - *The Kuomintang issues terms for registration* 139
- "A Confused Situation" 140

PERIOD THREE 1927-1937

IX CHINA UNDER THE KUOMINTANG, 1927-1937

- Unification and Reconstruction, 1927-1928 143
- Disasters and Achievements, 1929-1933 144
- A New China Emerges, 1934-1937 146
- Rural Reconstruction and the New Life Movements 148
  - *New life movement* 150
- Student Unrest 150
- The Christian One Per Cent 152

X FROM MISSIONARY TO CHINESE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, 1927-1937

- Devolution in Missionary Education, 1927-1928 155
  - *Involuntary devolution* 155
  - *The shock of devolution* 156
  - *Voluntary devolution, or transfer of control* 157
- Effects of Transfer of Control 161
  - *Kuomintang attitude toward Christian schools* 161
  - *Rapprochement between missionary and Chinese educators* 163
  - *Alienation of some Western supporters* 166
- The Religious Liberty Issue and Registration 167
  - *The registration process* 167
  - *Difference of opinion between church and school groups* 168
  - *Situation among middle schools, 1928-1929* 170
  - *CCEA pressure to register* 171
  - *New regulations bring "Petition of the Chinese Churches"* 172

CHAPTER PAGE
Reply to the churches from Chiang Mon-lin 172
Chinese unanimous on necessity for Christian schools 174
Results of Registration: Education 176
"*More efficient*" 176
"*More Chinese*" 178
"*More Christian*" 180
Results of Registration: Church 185
Concern for religious education 185
Rise of the religious education movement 185
Significance to the church 187
Results of Registration: Missionary Role 188
Primary field closed 188
Desired in secondary schools and colleges 189
Desired in religious education 191

XI SUMMARY
A Changed Educational Role 193
Major Fields of Change 194
Chinese civilization 194
Chinese government 199
Race conceptions 202
Christianity 203
In Conclusion 205

PERIOD FOUR

XII CHINA–A FORECAST 207

CHINA AND EDUCATIONAL AUTONOMY

CHAPTER I

China and the Western Powers, 1807-1902

CHINA'S DYNASTIES

THE Chinese Empire, welded by Ch'in Shih Hwang-ti (First Emperor), B.C. 221, endured for more than two thousand years, until 1911 A.D. Except for the "Four Centuries of Confusion" between the two great dynasties, the Han and the T'ang, when China was divided into segments, China has seen the rise and fall of six major dynasties: Han, T'ang, Sung, Yüan, Ming, and Ch'ing (Manchu). This rise and fall of dynasties in China is comparable to the rise and fall of empires in the West. Out of a long historical experience, China has learned that power never rests permanently with any one group, a discovery which was rationalized into the theory of the duty of revolution. When the ruling house was strong and able to establish a firm government, it was obvious that this dynasty had the mandate of heaven. But, when rebellions began and dykes fell into disrepair and floods and famine and banditry stalked the land, it was equally obvious that the dynasty had lost the mandate of heaven. "Heaven hears as the people hear; heaven sees as the people see." It then became the duty of another group to establish order. With this well-understood philosophy of history, while a dynasty always spoke in terms of "ten thousand years," no dynasty ever attempted to write its own history. Records were carefully kept, sealed, and put away to be opened by the historians of the succeeding era.

The nineteenth century found the sands of the Manchu dynasty running low. Rebellions were widespread, and, just as power was slipping from the Throne to the provinces, Westerners were clamoring for admittance. This Western aggressiveness was resented by the Manchus, who understood all too well the unsettling effect it would have upon their hold on their Chinese subjects. It was likewise resented by the Chinese, who were caught in the position of a mounted horseman attacked just as a change of mount was due. The danger delayed the change, and the delay of change increased the danger. That dynasties should end in rebellions and chaos was to be expected, but there was a new factor in the situation: namely, the threat to China's integrity by the Western Powers.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

From 1557, when China permitted the Portuguese to erect a few buildings at Macao, until 1838, when the British attacked China, foreign merchants were restricted to residence in Macao and proceeded to their warehouses on the Canton water-front at stated seasons, always under strict Chinese surveillance. The first intimation that conditions were to be changed came a few months before the death of Robert Morrison, pioneer Protestant missionary to China from the London Missionary Society, who lived and worked in Macao and Canton, 1807-1834. He reported the agitation in Canton when the news came of the breaking of the charter of the East India Company by Parliament. Hitherto, the East India Company had held the monopoly of the China trade. Morrison wrote:

> Canton is greatly agitated by the new system. Hopes and fears alternate. I pretend not to foretell the consequences. They appear to me to be great, and I pray that they may be beneficial—not only to England, but to China: for I am not that patriot who would wish to aggrandise my own country by the ruin or injury of another. I do not think that Christianity admits of such patriotism. But, few consider the welfare of China in all their speculations about free trade, etc.[1]

Proof that these forebodings were well-founded came with the first Anglo-Chinese War, (1838-1840). By the Treaty of Nanking (1842), Hongkong was ceded to the British, and five treaty ports were opened to trade and residence: Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai. Less than twenty years later, there came the second Anglo-Chinese War, following which, by the Treaty of Tientsin (1860), further ports, coast and inland, were opened for trade and residence. Also, by virtue of the Toleration Clauses in the Tientsin Treaty, missionaries were allowed to proceed anywhere, protection guaranteed to them and their "work." These two defeats by the British and the defeat in 1895 by Japan (in the war over Korea) exposed China's weakness to the world, and the West was persuaded that the days of China's independence were numbered. The spring of 1898 found China surrendering helplessly in the "Battle of the Concessions" and being forced to sign away her ports in leases varying from twenty-five to ninety-nine years to Germany, Russia, France, and Great Britain, while Japan, through her acquisition of Formosa (1895), demanded Fukien as a zone of special privilege. The Empress Dowager seized the Throne on September 22, 1898, inaugurating her "conservative reforms" [2] and encouraging the development of a patriotic movement—the Boxer movement—with which she attempted, in the summer of 1900, to drive all foreigners into the sea. When her war against all the world failed, she and the Manchu Court fled ignominiously to Sian, while the representatives of the Western Powers occupied Peking until the autumn of 1901. The fact that the viceroys and governors maintained order in sixteen of the eighteen provinces made the terms of the peace settlement easier than they would otherwise have been. China's integrity was maintained by the Protocol of Peking, and she was given time to set her house in order.

Social Change

Social change came about very, very slowly in the nineteenth century. Contacts with Westerners (exclusive of Russians) were confined to Canton until 1842, and to Canton and four other treaty ports until 1860. After 1860, the opening of further ports, the opening of Peking, the capital, to residence by diplomats, and the opening of all China to a "cultural invasion" by the missionaries, who increased from a hundred to some two thousand between 1860 and 1900 (*See* Appendix A), inevitably made for change. A "College for Diplomats" (*T'ung Wen Kuan*) of which W. A. P. Martin, of the Northern Presbyterian Mission, was president for many years was established in Peking, so that Chinese might study European languages and laws. Auxiliary schools were established in Canton and Shanghai, also naval colleges, technical schools and arsenals—the first institutions of Western learning to be established in China. Gradually, cables were laid; the first telegraph line between Shanghai and Tientsin was built in 1881; the first railway was built in Chihli in 1887.[3] The Chinese press began to develop, in connection with which two missionaries were outstanding: Young J. Allen, Southern Methodist, in the period 1870-1900, and Timothy Richard, English Baptist, who became prominent in the 1880's.[4]

Reform Movement and Counter-Revolution

With the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1894, the tempo changed. Dr. Allen's monthly, *Wan-kuo Kung-pao* (*Review of the Times*), doubled its circulation in 1894 and quadrupled it in 1895. K'ang Yu-wei became the Father of the Reform Movement and his pupil, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, became its publicist. The Hanlin Reform Society was organized in Peking in 1895,[5] and the Emperor himself became the center of the Reform Movement [6] which culminated in the "One Hundred Days of Reform," June 11–September 22, 1898, when there were issued a series of decrees designed to effect a complete reorganization of the Chinese government.[7] Among the "reforms" were such changes as the establishment of universities at Peking and Nanking; the sending of Imperial Clansmen to Western countries to study; more vigorous efforts at railway building; the organization of school boards "in every city in the empire"; [8] the establishment of the Imperial Customs Post, of commercial bureaus, of a system of budgets, and the like. Of these decrees Isaac Taylor Headland wrote:

> There is not one . . . that would not have been a most useful move for the Chinese government to make; and if the Emperor had been allowed to proceed, putting into operation all of them, as he did some, China would at present be close upon the heels of Japan in the adoption of Western ideas.[9]

It is within the realm of possibility that, had the powers shown any consideration for China during these one hundred days instead of wringing further concessions for the development of their respective "spheres of influence," the policy of the Reformers might have won general support. But, the policy of the powers, plus the unfortunate mistake on the part of the reformers who took Yüan Shih-k'ai into their confidence, turned the tables against them. The Empress Dowager seized power, imprisoned the Emperor, appointed an heir apparent, killed some of the most outstanding of the young Reformers, and sent some liberal officials into hiding. K'ang Yu-wei and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao fled the country. Temporarily, "progress" was at an end.

EDUCATION

Traditional. The aim of traditional education in China had always been to secure "the repose of the state." [10] Given a sufficient number of able officials, the state was not further concerned. Education was left, for the most part, to private initiative, and the results of education were tested by the Imperial Civil Service Examinations. The teacher who had the greatest number of successful candidates at these examinations had great prestige.[11] There was a certain amount of popular education because of the recognition of the value of the moral training in the Confucian Classics. P. W. Kuo describes the condition of public education in China on the eve of a new educational era in these words:

> There is nothing approaching a system of common schools maintained by the state. . . . Popular education is almost entirely left to private enterprise and public charity, the government contenting itself with gathering the choicest fruits and encouraging their production by rewards in the way of degrees, official titles, and other public recognition.[12]

In the stable, agricultural society of Old China, the system worked. There was a widely diffused respect for learning; there was an intellectual aristocracy instead of an hereditary one; the officials were, at least, capable of industry. In short, Chinese civilization was preserved. But, in the face of two defeats by the British, the question arose as to what was lacking in Chinese education.

In Transition. The first attempts at the assimilation of the new learning manifested themselves according to the traditional pattern. The defense of the state was in the hands of the few; hence the attempt to modernize the examination system by the introduction of science and mathematics,[13] to establish schools for the training of specialists in Western civilization [14]—agriculture, medicine, mechanical engineering, military science, mining, and so on; [15] and to send "Educational Commissions" abroad for study.[16]

Agitation for a National System. The first evidence in the *Chinese Recorder* that those responsible for their country's welfare were thinking of a national system of schools is found in connection with the review of Dr. W. A. P. Martin's book, *A Report of Education in the West*, published by the T'ung Wen Kuan Press.[17] Dr. Martin, president of this institution, had been commissioned by the Bureau of Foreign Affairs to observe and report on the educational systems in use in Europe, America, and Japan. As this work in two volumes came out under government auspices, the reviewer was optimistic that it would be read by a wide circle. Attacks on the old educational system grew more frequent as the years passed. Finally, there came the disastrous war of 1894-1895, after which it became certain that there must be a thoroughgoing reform of education. The viceroy, Chang Chih-tung, gathered up a number of the current essays written by students in the modern schools at Shanghai and published them under his own name. This book came out with the Kuang Hsü Emperor's Imperial sanction and was read by millions. It paved the way for the first national system, decreed in 1902. In later years, when Buddhist and Taoist temples were pressed into use as schools and when students began to go to Japan by the thousands, the suggestions became actually operative. These suggestions are still being followed today in remote villages, for, while China's leaders turned to reform in 1902, decades would be needed to develop a modern educational system in the vastness that is China.[18]

Entrance of Protestant Christians

Christianity secured a foothold in China under the Ming. Two earlier attempts to plant Christianity—in the T'ang era and in the Yüan (Mongol) period—were abortive, but the third attempt, when the two Jesuit priests, Matteo Ricci and Michael Ruggerius, entered China via Macao, in 1587, was successful. The Roman Catholic Church, therefore, had been established for two centuries before the arrival of a Protestant missionary in 1807. Fortunately for Morrison, he received an offer to become "translator" for the East India Company, and the acceptance of this position legalized his residence at Macao and enabled him, not only to be independent of the support of the London Missionary Society, but also to finance his own tracts and found the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca. Furthermore, the position did not interfere with the work he had set for himself, namely, the compilation of a dictionary and the translation of the Bible. When colleagues were sent out by the Society and were denied the right of residence in Macao, they settled, at his advice, in the cities of the Indian Archipelago—Malacca, Batavia, Penang, Singapore, *et al*—and worked among the Chinese emigrants to those cities.[19] Beginning in 1830, American missionaries also began to arrive and to establish themselves, waiting for an opportunity to enter China.[20] Between 1842 and 1860, both Catholic and Protestant missionaries entered the treaty ports, and, after 1860, under the Toleration Clauses, they were free to enter interior China, and the Chinese government was bound by the terms of the treaty to protect them and their converts. The natural result of this protection of missionaries by treaty was to fix the firm belief in the minds of the Chinese that missionaries were paid agents sent out by their respective governments and that Chinese Christians were working for a Western country against their own country. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Manchu officials resorted to tactics of weakness. Through the *Ching Shih Wen* of 1886 (the official Blue Books) they spread evil reports of the missionaries, representing them as enemies of the state and of humanity.[21] Nevertheless, the number of Protestant missions, missionaries, and Chinese Christians increased during the nineteenth century as Table 1 shows. (See Appendix A.)

TABLE 1

Year	*Societies*	*Missionaries*	*Communicants*
1807	1	1	
1840	4	20	100
1864	24	189	
1869			5,753
1889	41	1,296	37,287
1893	44	1,324	55,093
1900			112,808

A remarkable testimony as to the regard in which Christians were held by the Reform party is contained in the new *Ching Shih Wen* of 1898. Included among essays and documents written by a member of the Imperial family, viceroys, judges, Hanlins, and other noteworthy personages of the Manchu regime, there were thirty-one essays by Timothy Richard, five by the veteran missionary, Young J. Allen, and one by the former British Consul-General, George Jamieson, C. M. G. Some of the Reformers even wrote in defense of Christianity in this work.[22] But the very month in which an account of the new *Ching Shih Wen* appeared in the *Chinese Recorder* was the month of the Empress Dowager's *coup* *d'etat* against the Reform party. A year later she was encouraging the Boxers, and among the first victims in her war against all foreigners were the Chinese Christians, who, throughout the winter of 1899-1900, were burned out or set adrift in the cruel snows of North China, suffering martyrdom for their faith.[23]

CHAPTER II

Protestant Missionaries and Education, 1807-1902

INTRODUCTION

FOR a period of ninety-five years, Protestant educational missionaries might be termed forerunners of China's national system of education. These ninety-five years fall into two parts: the period of individual effort (1807-1877), seventy years, and the period of organized effort (1877-1902), twenty-five years. The effect of the organization of the School and Textbook Committee in 1877 was instantly reflected in the increase of educational material in the *Chinese Recorder* as shown in Table 2. Similarly, the organization of an educational association in 1890 was reflected.

This table begins with the first volume of the *Chinese Recorder* and is carried through May, 1895, the month after the signing of the Treaty of Shimonoseki. After that date, China was in what Dr. Headland describes as "an educational ferment." [2] Seven eventful years followed; 1902 was the year when the national system of schools was decreed and the missionary system of schools begun. Before 1902, there were schools of Western learning; after that date, there were government schools and mission schools.

TABLE 2

Educational Material in the *Chinese Recorder*[1]

Topics	*1868-1876*	*1877-1889*	*1890-May 1895*
Educational policy	1	3	4
English	1	4	1
Reports of local educational work	1	2	3
Standards for textbooks		1	1
Minutes (Textbook Committee)		9	
Notes and Items (Ed. Department)			19
Language and terminology		6	7
Educational reform		5	2
Education of the blind and deaf		2	4
Defense of education as mission work			6
Day schools			6
Educational Association of China			3
Student problems			3
Educational trends in the West			2
Education of women			1
Museums			1
Compilation of list of articles			1
Totals	3	32	64

A Period of Individual Effort, 1807-1877

Robert Morrison and the Anglo-Chinese College. Robert Morrison, pioneer Protestant missionary in China, was sent out by the London Missionary Society. He arrived at Canton in 1807 on an American vessel (the East India Company had refused passage to a Protestant missionary), and he died in Canton on August 1, 1834, having served for twenty-five years as "interpreter" for the East India Company, which had denied him passage, and twenty-seven years as a missionary to China—most of the time a self-supporting one. The quaint inscription on his tomb at Macao reads in part:[3]

. . . he compiled and published
A DICTIONARY OF THE CHINESE LANGUAGE
Founded the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca;
And for several years labored alone on a Chinese version of
THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

Morrison was president *in absentia* of an institution founded with funds saved from his salary, and he appealed to Christians, rich and poor, in his native land for donations to this school, for he fondly hoped it would be the means of bringing both the light of the Christian religion and the light of science to the great Chinese Empire.[4] Concerning the Christian religion, the college regulations stated:

> These native youths shall not be required to profess the Christian religion, nor will they be compelled to attend Christian worship—they will, however, be invited to do so; and the order of the institution will require their attendance on all lectures given publicly.[5]

The curriculum called for an equal amount of time to be given to Chinese and English literature, and also for instruction in arithmetic, geography, "the use of Globes," etc.[6]

An English traveller described the students, "sons of peasants," as the recipients of a type of education denied the son of the Emperor of China.[7] The institution as originally planned was for both Chinese and Europeans, who would study, each, the culture and language of the other, but this dream was not realized. Students were recruited from the "charity schools" established by the missionaries in the cities of the Indian archipelago.[8]

Charity or Day Schools. The first charity school of the London Missionary Society was opened by William Milne at Malacca, in 1813; others followed.[9] Later missionaries, settling in other cities in this region, also opened charity schools as naturally as they opened preaching halls. Sandwiched in among the religious publications of the printing presses of Milne at Malacca and of W. H. Medhurst at Batavia, are the "School Book," "Primer," "Geography," "Arithmetic," etc.[10] As the name indicates, this type of school was regarded as church work in the country from which these missionaries came. Education was not a duty of the state in the England of the early nineteenth century.[11] But even had education not been a function of the church in England, it might have been undertaken by the missionaries for the simple reason that the Chinese regarded the employment of a Confucian scholar and the opening of a school as a worthy benevolence. It was one of the easiest forms of establishing contacts in a community. The only difference between the ordinary day school and the day school under mission auspices, was that in the latter the Bible and some elements of Western learning were taught. After twenty years' experience, however, Medhurst reported that the results were unsatisfactory. He said:

> It is true that the Christian books put into the hands of the children are all assiduously explained by the missionaries, but the schoolmasters, being heathen, and constantly with their pupils, are likely to undo in a . . . religious sense, what the missionary has been attempting during the brief interval of his visit.[12]

Medhurst ended his account with a plea for schoolmasters from England, who would devote themselves to the acquisition of the language, after which they would be able to teach Chinese children, and so bring up a generation of Christian schoolmasters in China. Such men, he said, would be doing as much toward the Christianization of China as ordained ministers.[13]

Between 1830 and 1842, American missionaries began to arrive, and these, too, invariably did educational work. Some opened day schools and one young Baptist missionary from Virginia, Mrs. Henrietta Shuck, who landed at Macao with her husband under cover of darkness in 1836, soon had a "family" of Chinese children to whom she taught English in the morning, and as much religion and geography and arithmetic as possible in English. In the afternoons, they were sent to a Chinese teacher.[14]

The Morrison Education Society. One educational venture of this period, although not strictly missionary, was closely connected with missionary education. The business community at Canton raised money for a memorial to Robert Morrison which took the form of the Morrison Education Society. The Rev. S. R. Brown, a Yale graduate, and his wife landed at Macao in 1839 and opened a school in their home somewhat along the lines of Mrs. Shuck's school. After 1842, this school was removed to Hongkong. It was under Mr. Brown's tutelage that Yung Wing was prepared for study in the United States at Yale University.[15]

Work on the Mainland, 1842-1877. Educational work began in the five treaty ports and Hongkong in 1842, and, following the Treaty of Tientsin in 1860, when missionaries were free to go anywhere, day schools, "boarding schools," and theological schools were opened elsewhere. Dr. Kuo says of these early schools:

> The schools thus founded, though not strictly confined to the children of Christians, remained chiefly as the place where new converts were educated and preserved from too intimate contact with the unbelieving world. . . . They had no well-established educational policy. Each school was opened as the exigency of the occasion demanded and the funds of the home board permitted. Their schools were, moreover, confined to the children of the humbler classes.

The few who acquired a Western education therein had little prospect of employment in the government. In spite of these and other shortcomings, it must be admitted that for some time the schools of the missionaries were practically the only institutions where some form of modern knowledge was taught and for this reason they may justly claim to have been the first modern educational institutions in China.[16]

The development of educational work that took place between 1842 and 1877 is shown in Table 3.[17]

TABLE 3

Missionary Society Schools

	11	12	2	
Type of School	*American*	*British*	*Continental*	*Totals*
Boys' Boarding Schools	19	8	3	30
Girls' Boarding Schools	24	12	2	38
Boys' Day Schools	93	70	14	177
Girls' Day Schools	57	24	1	82
Theological Schools	9	9	2	20
				347

The same statistical report gives the total number of organized churches as 312, with a total of 602 mission stations; missionaries were in residence at 91 of these stations, and 511 were out-stations.

The number of students in these institutions is shown in Table 4.

The total number of communicants is given as 13,035, a number which would certainly include the 231 theological students, and most of the boys and girls in the so-called "boarding schools."

TABLE 4

Missionary Society Schools

Type of School	11 *American*	12 *British*	2 *Continental*	*Totals*
Boys' Boarding Schools	347	118	146	611
Girls' Boarding Schools	464	189	124	777
Boys' Day Schools	1255	1471	265	2991
Girls' Day Schools	957	335	15	1307
Theological Schools	94	115	22	231
				5917

These "boarding schools" were, we are told, schools where missionary "assistants," or "helpers," were trained. The first article on education to appear in the *Chinese Recorder*, in the first volume in 1868, dealt with the topic, "Boarding Schools: Are They Desirable?" The author thought that they were, and most especially the girls' boarding schools, which, he said, were vitally connected with the success of the missionary enterprise.[18] He was dissatisfied with the name "boarding school," and suggested instead, "Training School for Missionary Helpers and Preachers" for the boys' school, and "School for Girls and Women" for the girls' school. In the latter were the future mothers of a generation who would have been brought up from infancy in a Christian environment, hence the importance of these schools for girls and women. The majority of these so-called boarding schools were definitely not patterned after the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca, but were training schools for missionary assistants. There were several, however, which must have approached what we usually mean by the term "boarding school." The original Anglo-Chinese College had been removed from Malacca to Hongkong after 1842 by the then principal, James Legge, afterwards famous as translator of the Chinese Classics.[19] And we have a statement by James Jackson, written in 1893, that upon his arrival in China in 1876 there was only one college that was at all well known, Sung Chen College, and that had been very recently established.[20] There was, he said, very little interest in higher education at this time.

The Trend Away From Educational Work. Between 1838—the date of the publication of Medhurst's book in which he asked for teachers who would devote their whole time to education—and the Conference of 1877, a great change had occurred in the attitude of the sending countries toward education. Education had become a responsibility of the state and as such was "secular" work. Missionaries were sent out to evangelize, and education was thought by many to form no part of the missionary's task.[21]

The general attitude toward education was reflected in the lack of articles on the subject in the *Chinese Recorder.* Only two articles on education appeared in this journal between its first publication (May, 1868) and the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries (May, 1877), and both of these were in the first volume.[22] The series of reports of the development of mission work appearing in each issue of the *Chinese Recorder* in 1876-1877 invariably fell into three divisions: evangelistic, literary, and medical. When education was mentioned at all, it was usually in connection with evangelistic work.

A PERIOD OF ORGANIZED EFFORT, 1877-1902

School and Textbook Series Committee. The appointment of the committee "To Prepare a Series of School Books" [23] at the Conference of 1877, after the valiant defense of education on that occasion, led by the versatile Presbyterian missionary, C. W. Mateer, successfully turned the tide for Christian education in China.[24] It is also worthy of note that the Chinese government influenced the decision of the Conference to appoint such a committee. John Fryer, who had come out originally under the Church Missionary Society (Church of England), had been engaged by the Kiangnan Arsenal Press in Shanghai to translate scientific works into Chinese. He attended the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries with an offer on behalf of his press to print any schoolbooks authorized by the Conference. The Conference accepted this offer and appointed him on the committee. He became general editor, served as Honorary Treasurer, and the books were handled by the Kiangnan Arsenal Press and stored in their depots.[25] Under the general conditions of travel and communication and with no common mission headquarters, it is difficult to conceive the work of the School and Textbook Committee apart from the services of Mr. Fryer.[26]

The work of the School and Textbook Committee was a distinct disappointment, however, to the educational missionaries who had been led to expect a series of textbooks that would be useful in mission schools. The first article on education to appear after the Conference of 1877 was by Dr. Mateer, entitled "School Books for China," in which he explained the difference between a schoolbook and a treatise.[27] Despite this article, only a handful of schoolbooks was published by the School and Textbook Committee. Instead, as the final list reveals,[28] there were volumes on international law, history, philosophy, religion, science (Mr. Fryer prepared fifty-three "treatises" on scientific subjects!), and the like. The one Chinese member of the committee, the Rev. Y. K. Yen, wrote the one educational work, a translation of Herbert Spencer, listed as *Education*, and prepared a "Map of the World in Hemispheres." [29] A few schoolbooks were prepared by Dr. Mateer and one or two others. But, despite the failure of the committee to do the specific task for which they were appointed, their work was educational in the wider use of that term, and the response of the Chinese public was such as to lead the chairman of the Committee, Alexander Williamson, to appeal for funds to found, in 1887, the Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge, now known as the Christian Literature Society. This Society, strictly speaking, is the real successor to the School and Textbook Committee, rather than the Educational Association of China (usually referred to as the EAC), although accounts generally speak of the EAC as having grown out of the School and Textbook Committee.

The Educational Association of China. The Educational Association of China, or EAC, was organized by thirty-seven of the 445 persons who attended the second General Conference of Protestant Missionaries in 1890.[30] The figures indicate that there was still a strong feeling against education as secular. Dr. Jackson wrote in 1893: "Unfortunately, educational work is often spoken of as distinct from, if not incompatible with, evangelistic work." [31]

The initial impetus for its organization was given by the English Wesleyan, W. T. A. Barber, then headmaster of a school in Wuchang, who became, in consequence, the first secretary. After 1877, in response to the demands of the times for a knowledge of English [32] and science, the number of Anglo-Chinese colleges had begun to increase. Mr. Barber, as headmaster of one of these institutions, wrote shortly before the Conference of 1890 on the need of teachers to organize and work together instead of individually. He said:

> There is at present a vast amount of labor being put forth in various places to meet the demand of China for Western learning. Many of us are feeling the penalty of being a day *before* the fair, but we are all sure that the demand is increasing. . . . The present is an era of isolation in work and method. There are no regular lines marked out; books are constantly being published with every variety of terminology and literation. . . . Why not boldly enlarge the

> School and Text Book Committee into an Examining Board to cooperate with a few selected from among themselves by the professors of the various government colleges? Let them . . . issue a syllabus of a public examination for all Western schools in China.[33]

As Mr. Barber points out, the two chief problems were the terminology (for the new learning) and standardization. After all the efforts of the School and Textbook Committee, the final report admitted a very small modicum of success.[34] The missionaries who were writing books on anatomy, physics, etc. refused to be regimented by Mr. Fryer, despite his insistence upon the necessity for regimentation, as when he pointed out that the very appropriate term coined by a pioneer author for nitrogen was "deliberately" used several years later by another equally eminent author as the term for hydrogen! "Imagine," said he, "the difficulty that must result when a Chinese, who has mastered Dr. Hobson's elementary work, comes to use the more elaborate treatise by the subsequent writer." [35]

As a solution for the problem of standardization, Mr. Barber pointed to the tremendous improvement in sleepy, inefficient English schools resulting from the system of "Middle-class Local Examinations," given first by Oxford and later by Cambridge, in the 1860's. If this system were introduced in China, Mr. Barber thought, the benefits to isolated government and missionary schools would be inestimable.[36] There is no idea here of division between the government and mission schools: all were schools of "Western learning."

The Educational Association of China, organized at the Conference of 1890, appointed a Publications Committee for the preparation of schoolbooks and to act as receiver for the books and other assets of the School and Textbook Committee,[37] and also a committee of five to work on a Public

Examination Scheme along the Oxford-Cambridge lines suggested.[38] The Publications Committee functioned from 1890 until the Seventh Triennial of the EAC, in 1912, after which a reorganization took place. The "Public Examination Scheme" languished after Mr. Barber's departure from China in 1892, but was revived during the Reform period, and, ironically, the final "Scheme" appeared in the very month that Allied armies were marching to the relief of the legations in Peking.[39]

Higher Education and the Planting of Christianity. Along with the growing demand of the Chinese for English and science, there was a growing conviction on the part of certain missionaries that Christianity would never become rooted in China through the efforts of missionaries alone. It was imperative, according to the missionary advocates of higher education, that a highly-trained ministry be developed. The most outspoken article on this subject was by Dr. Jackson. He said:

> We all know the limitations of the average missionary, and we are able fairly well by this time to estimate what is likely to be the result of his effort in unaided evangelistic work. . . . If we mean to spread rapidly, we must set about in good earnest the training of men who can do what most foreigners cannot do.[40]

This conviction strengthened the growing group of missionary educators and launched the cause of Anglo-Chinese education, which was winning favor, not only because it gave opportunity to make contacts with non-Christians, but because missionaries were making slow headway in evangelistic work.

MISSIONARIES AND A NATIONAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

Missionary Agitation For a National System of Schools. The initial work in arousing public sentiment to the need of a state-sponsored system of schools in China was done by the German missionary-scholar, Ernst Faber, who entered China in the service of the Rhenish Mission in 1865.[41] A prolific author in German, English, and Chinese, his first Chinese work of importance, *Western Schools*, was published in 1873,[42] and his second, *A Treatise on Education*,[43] in 1875. A few years later, Dr. Martin was commissioned by the Bureau for Foreign Affairs (Tsung-li Yamen) to study and make a report on the educational systems in use in Europe, the United States, and Japan.[44] Following the appearance of Dr. Martin's book in 1883, the first writing on an educational system for China appeared in the *Chinese Recorder* in that year. Later, there were other articles as well as frequent references to a national system in articles on "Day Schools," "English," or other such topics. For some twenty years before the final impetus to a national system of schools was given by the Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895, the Protestant missionaries had been urging a modern system of education.

Beginning with the plan for a national system of schools prepared by Timothy Richard in 1894,[45] the *Recorder* reported various plans for an educational system. Gilbert Reid acting upon the advice of the British Minister worked out a plan and was able to present it to Prince Kung on the very day of its completion. The EAC, at its Second Triennial Meeting, heard a plan outlined by A. P. Parker, of the Southern Methodist Mission, and appointed an "Educational Reform Committee," which was to study various systems and prepare an eclectic system for China.[46] Then came the famous collection of essays edited by Viceroy Chang Chih-tung, *An Exhortation to Learning*, which was translated by S. I. Woodbridge (Southern Presbyterian) and ran monthly in the Educational Department of the *Chinese Recorder* for almost a year, beginning in November, 1898. This brought to a dramatic climax the period of agitation. The book was read by millions, and the missionaries regarded the cause won.

The EAC Prepares To Give China a National Educational System. There were few articles by missionaries on educational topics in 1899, because of the monthly appearance of the translation of Viceroy Chang Chih-tung's work. The Third Triennial of the EAC met in May, 1899, and heard another paper by Dr. Parker,[47] in which he pointed to the ready response of the people to the Emperor's Edict—during the "One Hundred Days of Reform"—ordering the conversion of a certain proportion of the Buddhist temples into schools, and to the wide sale of the EAC textbooks, both of which were evidence that the people were ready for change. This meant that the counter-revolution of the reactionaries could not win, and the question that faced missionary educators, Dr. Parker said, was:

> How to secure and retain control of the educational movements that are now being inaugurated by the people and the government officials.[48]

And so, despite the persecution of Christians and Reformers, and the reinstatement of the Eight-Legged Essay into the Imperial Examinations by the Empress Dowager,[49] the editor of the Educational Department declared in October, 1899:

> King Canute's commands to the waves were no more in vain than all attempts to extinguish the torch of truth. The future belongs to the new learning, and we can afford to labor on in patience.[50]

His reasons for so saying were that Chang Chih-tung was going calmly ahead with his new schools in Wuchang and that mission schools were never more crowded.[51]

Throughout the winter of 1899-1900, despite the growing persecution of Christians in the North, the EAC Committee continued work on an "Examination Scheme" for the Chinese Empire in Western subjects, so that successful candidates might possess certificates having "some recognized value." [52] When the last act in the drama of counter-revolution was played in the summer of 1900, and a routed Court had fled to Sian, a writer in the Educational Department likened this "backward swing" to "the drawing of a bow."[53] The editor challenged the Educational Association of China to be worthy of its name and "prepared to direct the future course of education in China." [54] A contributor put the question thus:

> Shall we give China a thorough system of national education—a *national* system—or shall we allow a system to grow gradually out of the national life of the future?[55]

It seems probable that if the Reform party had been restored to power, they and the missionaries might have continued friendly relationships, and missionaries might have been employed to assist with the setting up of a national system of schools, for in such a case, there would have been no resentment bred of defeat on the part of the ruling group. It seemed good to the victors, however, to restore the counter-revolutionaries: the old Empress Dowager and the Manchu clique.[56] As soon as indications pointed to the restoration of the Conservatives, a new note crept into missionary thinking.

Disillusionment. By the summer of 1901, it began to be apparent that the EAC was to have competition in the matter of assisting China with a national educational system. Dr. Parker wrote:

> We Europeans and Americans may have been telling ourselves all along that the teachers for the new schools of Western learning that the Chinese are going to establish

> throughout the country, are to come from Europe and America. But we must not be too sure about this. It is evident that the Japanese are going to underbid us in the matter of salaries and also that they are going to be able to do much of the work of teaching and preparing books, nearly, if not quite as well as the foreigners can do it. They have learned from us the power there is in the new learning to gain control of a nation, and they are working energetically towards a point where they will occupy a commanding position in the political and educational affairs of China. They have already become a power in Far Eastern politics which Western governments have to reckon with, and they are fast becoming a power in the educational development of China that we Western educationalists will have to reckon with also.[57]

In May, 1901, the new editor of the Educational Department, J. A. Silsby, of the Northern Presbyterian Mission, had expressed great optimism as to the demand for the Christian teacher when peace should be restored. He would be desired as a teacher of English and of "Western learning," and there would be an opportunity for him, because of this demand, to teach the "Holy Book which lies at the foundation of all that is best in the learning of the West." [58] His next utterance, in October, was of quite a different kind. The Empress Dowager, the incarnation of reaction to the missionaries, had issued Edicts from Sian, asking for suggestions as to progressive measures which should be taken for the good of the empire. Among the suggestions in response, there had been plans for a national system of education. Mr. Silsby wrote:

> There is so little of good faith and honest purpose in government circles, that . . . one is not much to be blamed if he sees in the decrees which come from Hsian-foo (Sian-fu)

> little more than a crafty attempt to deceive the foreigner and gain favorable consideration from the representatives of foreign governments. . . . All these things we read with interest but with a good deal of skepticism. . . . The work of the Christian educationist will not be less important but all the more necessary in view of these changes, and . . . most of us will find a broader and more effective field of usefulness in mission schools than in accepting flattering offers from Chinese officials.[59]

There were no further plans or "beneficent schemes" [60] in preparation for the day when the EAC would be asked to provide a system of modern schools for China. Such accounts as came in reported all schools crowded—mission, government, and private—and that Japanese influence was gaining in government and private schools in China.[61] The Court returned from Sian in January, 1902, and shortly thereafter, Dr. Martin and his staff of Western teachers were eulogized and bowed out of the Imperial University at Peking on the ground of lack of funds.[62] A ruling was put out in Shantung that all students in that province would be expected to "worship Confucius" twice a month. This ruling brought the resignation of W. M. Hayes from the position of president of the new "Chi-nan-fu College" which he had accepted in September, 1901, on the understanding with Yuan Shih-k'ai, the head of the province, that he would be free to teach the Christian religion to the students. There had been no intimation that these bimonthly Confucian ceremonies were to be compulsory for all students, Christian and non-Christian alike, and the sudden order after the Court's return seemed to emanate from that source.[63] Soberly, the missionaries turned to the provision of a type of education which, in the words of the president of the EAC, would give "an undergirding of righteousness" because of a vital trust in God.[64] In this mood they prepared for the Fourth Triennial in 1902.

EDUCATION: THE MISSIONARY'S SPECIAL FIELD

With the growth of modern education in China, there developed among the educational missionaries the view that education, or "Western learning" (*hsi hsüeh*), was the special prerogative of Westerners. Dr. Jackson, after stating his view that the missionary as an evangelist was usually a failure and that, if results were to be had, the missionaries should set about training Chinese who could do what foreigners could not do, completed the sentence by saying:

> and the foreign missionary must seek a field of employment, a branch of work which is more adapted to him, *which he can do better than any native.* (Author's italics.) [65]

In December, 1899, an English Baptist missionary wrote:

> Why should we hesitate to assert that in the important art of teaching we are altogether superior?
>
> Let it be remembered that this art is a modern one, as new almost as the science of chemistry.[66]

But the Kiangnan Technical School for the training of mechanical engineers and the other government schools which were coming into existence were all being developed with the idea of becoming independent of Westerners. The insistence upon English was also due to this desire.[67] In 1901, a Chinese scholar of considerable reputation, Lo Chen-yu,

> deplored the tendency of his time to ask foreigners to run the newly established modern educational institutions.[68]

This attitude among Chinese was developing at the very time when educational missionaries were contending that education was the special prerogative of the Westerner in China.

CHAPTER III

Years of Brewing Revolution, 1902-1909

GROWTH OF THE POLITICAL UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT

WHEN the Manchu Court espoused "Reform," the true revolutionary turned to Sun Yat-sen, and the years 1902-1909 saw the growth of an underground political movement with its several abortive attempts at revolution. A report entitled "Canton, 1901-1910" says:

> The decade (1900-1910) has been one of ceaseless agitation. The revolutionary propaganda has been incessantly carried on. Secretly but untiringly these societies are moving and the leaven is working. The recent attempt at revolution in Canton failed, it is true, but it shows how events are turning and was a sharp reminder of this element in our midst. It cannot be said that the influence of the officials has grown stronger during these years. . . . Since 1900, there have been no less than nine viceroys. . . . With this continual alteration it is no wonder that the grip of the higher officials on the province is often slack. There has been a marked growth in the national spirit.[1]

The first mention of Sun Yat-sen in the *Chinese Recorder* is in 1908, in connection with the rebellion in Yunnan. His followers were armed with modern rifles, according to the report, and the government took the matter quite seriously.[2] The government also took steps about this time to limit the number of students who went to Japan, for it was alarmed at the revolutionary political ideas they brought back. Sun Yat-sen, indeed, had discovered that the awakened minds of these Chinese students in Japan were an ideal milieu for the spread of his anti-Manchu propaganda.[3]

The Manchu regime, under pressure, made numerous concessions in the attempt to hold the eighteen provinces. Racial distinctions were abolished, permitting intermarriage, in 1902.[4] The national educational system was decreed in 1902 and launched in 1903. The old examination system was abolished in 1905. Administrative and other reforms were made, and a constitution and parliament were promised in 1906. But these reforms, reluctantly granted, came too late to be of any avail. A writer from Canton in 1908 says:

> But notwithstanding all the promises of the Throne, we find the people still discontented. It is a matter of serious doubt whether the conciliatory reforms of the government, removing as far as possible all differences between the races, will be able to cast out of the Chinese mind the intense hatred of the Manchu. The Chinese idea of patriotism is to drive him back over the great wall whence he came. Much as the government fears a foreign foe, her greatest fear is a consolidated revolt of the eighteen provinces. And indeed there is reason to fear. . . . There is no doubt that a revolution is pending and that some are against any compromise less radical than the complete evacuation of Chinese territory by the Manchu.[5]

And so it proved.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

There was no further attempt by the Empress Dowager and her advisers to drive the foreigners out of China during these years. What the Chinese felt was told by Dr. Hu Shih in 1925:

> We know that China had experience of western oppression and aggressiveness during the past decades, and several attempts were made against it. The last of these was the Boxer movement of 1900. From that experience China came to realize that such a blind and ignorant reaction is futile. As a result, during the first decade of the twentieth century we have been nonresistant to foreigners. During this period we find that foreigners have held everywhere the best positions, have had every advantage, while we have been left in constant fear of foreign intervention, and of the partition of our country. Although in our hearts we have felt humiliated we have remained quiet and patient, not daring to take any positive action.[6]

The policy of the Western powers during these years was one of inaction: they maintained the treaties then current, but made no attempt to secure new rights.[7] The Boxer movement had, at least, put an end to the more flagrant type of aggression.

SOCIAL CHANGE

The greatest social change of these years was in connection with China's interest in Western civilization. Of the year 1902, Timothy Richard wrote:

> This year we have witnessed a great change. . . . In eleven out of the eighteen provinces we have records of the opening of colleges for the study of western subjects. We find Japanese textbooks on western civilization translated

> by the score and circulated by the tens of thousands throughout the empire. . . . An intellectual army of 1,500,000, with their faces turned westward, is unprecedented and its results are difficult to exaggerate. This is the new China that opens before us.[8]

These were the years, 1902-1909, when Japan literally had young China at her feet. Japanese influence began to mount in 1902, when of two hundred and seventy-one Chinese men and three Chinese girls who were in Japan, only one hundred and sixty-one were on government scholarships. "A government reform may go to pieces with a change of officials, but a reform which emanates from the people will be apt to grow as the years go on." [9]

The movement did, indeed, emanate from the people, and after the defeat of Russia in 1905, thousands of young Chinese poured into Japan. Many of these were Chinese who had been preparing for years to take the civil-service examinations and who were left in the lurch by their abolition in 1905. Within a few years, the number of students in Japan climbed to thirteen thousand. As a Chinese student in Tokyo wrote in 1910:

> The abolition of the Imperial Literary Examinations . . . and the ease with which a few of the returned students (from Japan) obtained their literary degrees and high government offices caused a great increase of Chinese students. . . . Though a few were bent on real education, the majority went . . . merely for the name of being a returned student and for the prospect . . . of becoming officials. Consequently, there was a mad "speculative" rush for Japanese education, but few stayed longer than from three to six months.[10]

Not only did students pour into Japan as a short cut to the mastery of Western civilization, but everywhere books on

Western civilization were eagerly sought and read. Japanese publishers made haste to establish translation bureaus, and books previously translated into Japanese, were hastily put into Chinese. A Japanese speaker at the Fifth Triennial of the Educational Association of China said that Japan was "producing a literature for China," and that "almost any book on any subject in the various branches of human knowledge may be procured in Chinese." [11] He also listed journals which were published by Japanese in China.[12]

But the life of the non-reading people was more affected by the changes wrought in connection with the establishment of the national system of schools. Temples were confiscated, and their idols were dumped unceremoniously into the streets and allowed to lie there, or were burned or thrown into the river, while the temples were converted into schoolrooms.[13] As soon as might be, proper school buildings were erected, and the temples and grounds were restored to the Buddhist priests.[14]

Education

The first organized educational system in China is usually referred to as the "system of 1903," since that was the year in which a paper plan was worked out.[15] But "legally speaking," You-kwang Chu says, it dates to the Imperial Edict of 1902 which called for such a plan.[16] The outstanding facts concerning education in 1902 were the determination of the officials and people, to have an educational system, uncertainty as to just the type of system desired,[17] and the determination on the part of the Manchus to see that the new schools were kept loyal to the Throne and to Confucianism, the bulwark of the Throne.[18] The first educational system was modeled largely after the Japanese, and in 1904 there were over thirty-one thousand students in contrast to the twelve hundred and seventy-four in 1903, a figure which was trebled in 1905. But this progress was much too slow to suit the temper of the times, and when the Japanese defeated the Russians in 1905, Yuan Shih-k'ai, viceroy of Chihli and the organizer of a new army in the North, together with several other prominent officials, appealed to the Throne to abolish the examination system so that the new system of national schools which was essential to China's survival as a modern state might make more rapid progress. The tenor of the memorial ran:

> The Russo-Japanese treaty of peace is about to be concluded and we are in greater danger than ever. We must arise and show the world that we are not conservative. The foreigners all point out to us the evil of our examination system. . . .
>
> The main aim in establishing schools is not only to select men of talent, but also to awaken the intelligence of the common people and develop universal education. . . . Schools everywhere and everyone studying will make China rich and strong. It was in this way that Prussia defeated France, and Japan, Russia.[19]

The result of this memorial was the Imperial Edict of September 2, 1905, ordering the abolition of the old examination system, which passed almost without protest.[20] The editor of the Educational Department of the *Chinese Recorder* commented:

> The present month will be forever memorable in the intellectual life of China on account of the Imperial Decree doing away with the famous system of examinations for degrees. . . . Nothing could show better the depth to which new ideas have penetrated the Empire than the fact that the examinations have vanished almost without a word of . . . protest.[21]

After 1905, the new learning really began to make progress, as shown in Tables 5 and 6.[22]

TABLE 5

Increase in the Number of Students

Year	*Students*
1903	1,274
1904	31,378
1905	102,767
1906	200,401
1907	547,064
1908	921,020
1909	1,301,168
1910	1,625,534

TABLE 6

Increase in Number of Schools [23]

Year	*Governmental*	*Public*	*Private*	*Totals*
1905	3,605	393	224	4,222
1906	2,770	4,829	678	8,477
1907	5,224	12,310	2,296	19,830
1908	11,546	20,321	4,046	35,913
1909	12,888	25,688	4,512	43,086
1910	14,301	32,254	5,793	52,348

When we look at these figures, there seems amazing progress, but in the vastness of China, these schools were very few. The Chinese were evidently disappointed that the increase had not been greater, for Dr. Pott wrote in 1908:

> The Ministry of Education has failed to fulfil the sanguine expectations . . . for at least two reasons. In the first place, the men of whom it is composed have had little practical experience in educational matters and, consequently, are not well qualified to deal with the problem. In the second place,

> they have been hampered from lack of funds. . . . Education is a costly matter, and the Chinese are hard pressed to find the funds.[24]. . .

A third cause, not mentioned by the writer, was the brewing revolution. Only the month before the appearance of Dr. Pott's article, Brownell Gage had written:

> Here in Changsha we hardly know which schools will close and which will open next term. . . . The Imperial Edict of 1903 directed that existing colleges be reconstructed as schools of the new learning. In attempting to obey this edict, Governor Chao Erh-hsuan "excited the hostility of the scholars and leading gentry" . . . This conservative party, both among gentry and officials, have been strengthened in the last year or two by the lawlessness of the students, especially those returned from abroad, and by the fears of revolution which they have excited. The events of a year ago . . . and the outrage committed on the person of one of the city Superintendents of Schools, by a revolutionary teacher and party of students—these and similar events show the difficulties under which any administration labors in attempting to establish a modern educational system here.[25]

This presents a graphic picture of the difficulties of the Manchu government. Conservatives and revolutionaries united to oppose the new schools—a case of politics making strange bedfellows.

But despite these and other obstacles, the Ministry of Education had some achievements to its credit. The first to be mentioned by Dr. Pott was its educational journal. (The "unhappy divisions" of Protestantism prevented the Christian Educational Association from having an educational journal until almost twenty years later. The storm against Christian schools had already broken when the first Christian educational journal appeared, March, 1925, edited by Sanford Chen, whose salary was made possible, not by a budget subscribed by the mission boards, but by a grant from the Institute for Social and Religious Research.) The second was the Ministry's school inspectors, whose reports filled the pages of the journal.[26]

The principal aim back of the new system of schools was, as has been deduced from Yüan Shih-k'ai's memorial, the strengthening of China for war. Arnold Foster reported from Wuchang that education and military preparations, colleges and barracks, were everywhere being pressed forward together.

> Preparation for war is unquestionably one main moving principle that underlies much of the zeal that the Chinese are showing for a new kind of learning. In a preface to a handbook of one of these schools we read:
>
> Our borders have been encroached upon, our mines have been wrested from us. The indemnity of today demands interest tomorrow. . . . Let our pupils remember, while they are at school, that our schools are Chinese, and that they are Chinese pupils, . . . and when they grow up, they will make the world know that we stand first among the civilized races. Will anyone then still cheat and wrong us? [27]

The Manchu clique, beyond a doubt, approved this warlike and nationalistic spirit, but they had also to think of maintaining their own precarious hold over these new schools. Accordingly, they criticized the system of 1903 for not having stated the aims of the new schools with sufficient clarity and force, and one of the first acts of the Ministry of Education, which was created in December, 1905, was to state the aims of education in these terms:

> Loyalty to the Throne; respect for Confucius; the awakening of the people to a sense of their national responsibility; the promotion of militarism; and the development of reality and practicality in education.[28]

Meantime, even before the system of 1903 was on paper, the Manchu element had taken certain precautions to keep the new schools loyal to the Throne by demanding the bimonthly ceremonies honoring Confucius of all students in government schools. This resurrection of an old law which had fallen into disuse revealed their growing nervousness over the passing of the old ways.[29] Rightly or wrongly, this requirement, which Dr. Martin [30] declared to be no more than a salute to the flag, was interpreted by the great majority of missionaries and Chinese Christians as "worship" of a dead saint and, as such, prohibitive for a Protestant. It proved to be the stimulus which resulted in a missionary system of schools.[31]

The Christian Community

The Protestant Christian community was very small in these years, only numbering 256,779 persons in 1905.[32] They were despised by their fellow countrymen as traitors to their country and spies of the foreigner, as this description shows.

> If the native convert is usually regarded by his officials and his compatriots as a denationalized subject, a foreign partisan, and alien, and a rebel in disguise, what must be their feelings towards one whose business it is to convert "loyal" subjects into such aliens and rebels? If in many quarters the native convert is sincerely believed to be the political spy and emissary of the foreigner, and the native pastor as his special agent, whose business is to enlist recruits for the ranks of these spies and emissaries, is it strange that he should be regarded as the enemy of his country and his presence in

> any community more feared and detested than desired and welcomed? Hence it is that the lot of the native pastor is a specially difficult one; often outside of his flock he is completely ostracized from the society of the community in which he lives; . . . Owing to his position as a pastor in the church, his Chinese civil rights are denied him, and he is accorded the treatment of a political outcast.[33]

It would be difficult to overestimate the price paid by early Christians for their faith. When a Chinese accepted Christianity in the nineteenth century, or in the first decade of the twentieth, he became an outcast from his family, from his guild, from his state. If he were a tailor, or a silversmith, or of whatever craft, his guild held its meetings in the temple. If he did not attend the guild rites, he was cast upon the mercy of the missionary for work and earned the stigma "rice Christian." A missionary writing in 1910 said:

> Our greatest missionary difficulty in China at the present is in connection with lawsuits. Here, again, we need to consider the Chinese point of view. Every guild protects its members, right or wrong. Every family expects to defend a member to any extremity. We take a man away from his family and his guild, make him a target of both, and then, if he becomes involved with officials or fellow men, we leave him to the tender mercies of his enemies. It does not seem very Christian, and it is a great cause of misunderstanding. I always try to emphasize the fact that the church is at present in an abnormal position and that the day will come when a Christian may expect full sympathy in all his trials from the church. That day, of course, will be when foreign intervention has disappeared and the church has grown strong enough to cleanse itself and be sure of the character of its members.[34]

Deliverance was nearer than the writer knew. The Revolution of October, 1911, did much to change the status of the Chinese Christian, and gradually the persecution of a member of the family who accepted Christianity went into the limbo of forgotten things.

The Chinese Christian and clergyman, according to Mr. Tong, suffered not only from his compatriots, but also from his foreign colleagues.

> Perhaps the most trying experiences the pastor has to encounter are in his relations with his foreign colleagues, who in many instances assume the role of masters and employers, treating their assistants more like servants and inferiors than co-workers. This is especially true in the treaty ports, where the missionary, through association with worldly-minded foreigners, becomes imbued with the spirit of racial pride and regards the Chinese as men of an inferior race. . . .[35]

The YMCA played an important part in these years, providing an outlet for Christian activities which were planned and executed by the Chinese themselves. A convention of the YMCA's of China and Korea met in Shanghai in March, 1907, and an editorial called attention to the ability of the Chinese who were the leaders of the Convention.[36] The following month, the editor of the *Recorder* called attention to the hurt experienced by the Chinese pastors when the one-hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Robert Morrison was celebrated without their participation.

> There is an unmistakable feeling on the part of many that they have been left out. . . . They remember the great Christian Endeavor Convention in Ningpo, when foreigners and Chinese sat side by side and had an equal part. There was fresh in their memory the recent Convention of the Young

> Men's Christian Association in which the Chinese took the leading part. . . . The native ministry is increasing in numbers and intelligence. It will not do to allow them to entertain the idea that they are being slighted.[37]

The Centenary Conference was the third purely missionary conference. There were only some 13,000 Chinese communicants (Protestant) in 1877, and around 37,000 in 1890, but in 1907, the number had grown close to 200,000. (See appendix A.) Never again would Protestant missionaries hold a meeting in which Chinese Christians were not included.

CHAPTER IV

The Rise of a Missionary System of Education,
1902-1909

Growth of Missionary Education, 1902-1909

THE years 1902-1909, which saw the remarkable development of government education, witnessed also the launching of a missionary system of education, and a rapid increase in the number of schools and students. Most of this development took place between 1902 and 1905, as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Year[1]	*Boarding Institutions*	*Students*
1902	Over 100	*ca.* 5000
1905	389 (incomplete)	15,137
1909	456 (18 colleges)	21,785 (919 college students)

Day schools grew between 1905 and 1909 at about the same rate as boarding institutions, so that, presumably, the rate of growth was approximately the same between 1902 and 1905, as shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Year	*Schools*	*Day School Pupils*
1905	2196	42,546
1909	2526	54,967

This expansion of schools, naturally, meant a great expansion of the missionary force and of Chinese teachers, who, according to Paul D. Bergen,[2] formed at least eight tenths of the teaching staff. It has never been possible to give statistics as to educational missionaries, because many missionaries did some teaching. It is known, however, that the missionary body was approximately doubled between 1902 and 1909. (See Appendix A.) The membership in the EAC reflected this increase, as shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Year	*Triennial*	*Total Membership*	*Missionaries on Field*	*Chinese Members*
1902	Fourth	249	*ca.* 2000	1
1905	Fifth	383	*ca.* 3500 (?)	2
1909	Sixth	490	4299	9

The Chinese membership in the EAC was lamentably small.

The cause of this acceleration in the growth of missionary education between 1902 and 1905 is explained by what took place in government education in 1901-1902 and by the action of the Fourth Triennial in 1902.

The Launching of a Missionary System of Education

The Fourth Triennial, 1902. The Fourth Triennial met in an unhappy, frustrated mood. The great optimism which had marked the two preceding Triennials was at an end. China had, indeed, turned to progress and modernization, but missionaries were to be ostracized. This was pointed out by both the vice-president, the Rev. John C. Ferguson, in the opening address of the Conference, and by Dr. D. Z. Sheffield's paper on the relation of Christian education to the Reform movements. The former, after citing the service of missionary educators in government institutions and the slurs that were now being cast at these same men who had built up such institutions as China had, continued with what he considered a far more serious matter, namely, the contemptuous attitude that the government was taking toward Western civilization.

> A careful reading of the various memorials concerning education which have recently been published will quickly dispel the idea that patriotism accounts for this opposition to foreigners, and will readily show that proud intolerance is at the root of it. These memorials in pointing out the value of a western education all speak of it as something to be used—*Yung*—while the ancient classical studies are the principle, the real thing—*T'i*. The occult idea . . . is that by making use of foreign subjects in schools the inherent natural superiority of classical learning will be asserted and magnified. I have failed to discover in any of these memorials any hint of humble acknowledgement that China is in urgent need of western education.[3]

Such an attitude, it was feared, would lead to very poor discipline where foreign subjects were concerned, and the pupils would be trained to venerate the Classics and think lightly of Western civilization, and would end by being more bigoted than their teachers.[4] As further evidence of this intolerance, there was the new ruling requiring the "worship of Confucius."

> Another evidence of intolerance is the new rule requiring all students of government schools to attend the bimonthly ceremonies in honor of Confucius and to prostrate themselves before his tablet. . . . Christian teachers and pupils have in the past quietly absented themselves and no attention has been paid to them. . . . This unobtrusive method of administration is now to be disturbed, and a sharp distinction drawn between ordinary pupils and Christians, thus introducing into schools the odious distinction made in common life between the ordinary people—*p'ing ming*—and the church people—*chiao ming*.[5]

All this led up to the urgent need of Christian schools.

> Missionary societies should not think that as government schools are established, there is less need of Christian schools. On the contrary, they should be increased. They should be able to broaden their curricula, to improve their standards of instruction, to be better equipped in libraries and laboratories, and thus make it possible to give as high a grade of education as can be found in any government school. In addition, they can throw around pupils such moral and religious influences as will make them stronger and more useful in public life.[6]

This paper, and Dr. Sheffield's, led to two resolutions, one on an appeal, through the diplomatic representatives in Peking, for more favorable treatment of Christian students in government schools,[7] and one addressed to the various mission boards on the need for Christian schools in China. The latter read:

> That the Executive Committee be instructed to prepare a memorial to be sent to the Secretaries and Presidents of

> the Boards of Missions in England and America, recommending the appointment of specially trained men and women for special branches of work and drawing particular attention to the need in industrial and kindergarten departments of missionary work.[8]

The Appeal to the Boards. This resolution and the document which was prepared as a result of it (See Appendix B) are as important to the history of Christian schools in China as the Imperial Edict of 1902 and the outline of the system of 1903 are to Chinese government education. Up to this point, all the thought and planning had been based upon the assumption that the EAC had been especially called into existence to provide China with a system of schools fitted to her needs by Westerners who understood both the educational systems of the West and the needs of China. Now, the missionaries feel that there is no recourse but to launch their own system, and they draft an appeal setting forth the educational situation as it is in 1902, and ask for a change of policy on the part of the Boards. Hitherto, ordained men have been sent, but the present demand is for persons especially qualified along educational lines. A system of elementary schools is needed for which teachers must be trained; kindergartens and industrial education need development; and the colleges need specialists. The reasons for this requested change of policy were that the rising government system might be influenced by such "superior examples" and the necessity for schools which would not require practices contrary to the Christian conscience. The document ends with this sentence:

> Let us therefore have trained specialists, laymen by preference, to come to this field to develop the educational work and thus take and hold our rightful position as educators and guides of the young mind of this great nation.

The use of the words "rightful position" implies that the missionaries did consider the planned government school system in the light of a challenge to their monopoly of the field of Western learning.

Dr. W. A. P. Martin and the Appeal to the Boards. The only comment on this document from the China end was from Dr. Martin, who, while warmly commending the plan to increase the educational work of missions, thought the document made an exaggerated claim, and suggested the following rewording:

> The modern educational system of China is now largely under the influence of Christians who are representatives of the various missionary societies. This brings practically within access of the Christian Church one fourth of the youth of the whole human family.[9]

He also disapproved the idea that Christians were to be excluded from the schools of their own government because of the bimonthly Confucian rites which, in his opinion, were purely commemorative and honorific, and no more idolatrous than the honors paid to national flags.

> To solve this question, I ask for nothing but cool logic, unbiased by any question of advantage. Yet to answer it one way will open all the schools of the Empire to our Christian youth, while to answer it in another way will place it in the power of the mandarins to shut them out like so many pariahs.[10]

This brief article by Dr. Martin was answered by the editor of the Educational Department, the Rev. J. A. Silsby, who expressed great respect for Dr. Martin, yet felt that the majority of Christians could not take the view suggested by him. While Dr. Martin might regard the ceremony as a token of respect for an admirable sage, Mr. Silsby neither admired Confucius, whom he regarded as a block to progress and as a representative of a system which was the chief obstacle to Christianity in China, nor was he willing to offend weaker Christians.[11] The lack of any further writing on the issue indicates that Mr. Silsby spoke for the missionary body as a whole. Chinese Christians seemed also to hold this view. The first document from "Chinese Educationists," at the Sixth Triennial, 1909, speaks of Christian students who have turned their backs on the Church, and who have bent the knee to Confucius, giving this as a reason for needed improvement in the matter of curriculum.

The Issue of Government Recognition

The Fifth Triennial (1905) and the Chinese Government. The Fifth Triennial which met in May, 1905, chiefly differed from the Fourth in its attitude toward the Chinese government. The proposed state-sponsored system of modern schools and the relation of Christians thereto was a principal topic of discussion in 1902. A resolution was passed at that time recommending

> that a committee of eight be appointed to present for this Association to the Doyen of the Diplomatic Body a memorial for presentation to the Chinese government, stating the aim and work of the Association and requesting that Christian students be not debarred from entering government institutions or required to observe ceremonies contrary to their Christian principles.[12]

In 1905, a report read as follows:

> The Rev. Y. J. Allen, for the Committee on Memorial to the Chinese government, reported that the Committee had done nothing. The report was accepted and the committee discharged.[13]

The topic of government relationships came up again in connection with the "Special Committee on a Permanent Commission for Educational Organization." [14] Here again, it was stated that the committee had held no meeting and prepared no report. A member of the EAC Executive, however, had

> drafted certain proposals looking to . . . a permanent commission of leading educationists to co-operate, if opportunity offered, with the Chinese government in planning and putting into effect an efficient and tolerant scheme of general education in China.[15]

There yet lacked over three months before the Edict abolishing the Imperial Examinations was issued, September 2, 1905. It will be recalled, the government system had failed to make much headway prior to the Edict; hence this proposal of seeking an opportunity to consult with the government on measures to put into effect "an efficient and tolerant scheme." These proposals were "laid on the table," and the reasons for this were given by the Rev. John C. Ferguson.

> It is my opinion that the proposed commission should not be constituted by this Association. It has been the bane of missionary enterprises that rightly or wrongly they have been blamed for interfering in governmental affairs in China, and Protestant missionaries have always put themselves on record as disclaiming such an intention. I hold no brief for the Chinese government, but . . . I would say that whereas the government is always glad to receive suggestions and help from individual missionaries of wisdom and experience, it would strongly resent any organized plan to interfere with its plans on the part of this or any other similar organization. . . .

> As to calling the attention of the government to the need of recognizing the graduates of Christian schools and of placing them on the same basis in civil service competitions as graduates from government schools, it seems to me that a misunderstanding exists. It is not desirable that Christian schools should prepare their students with the purpose of having them enter the regular government service. . . . Until the idolatrous duties incumbent upon a civil mandarin are abolished Christians cannot be mandarins. It is thus useless to call the attention of the government to the need of recognizing the graduates of Christian schools on the same basis as those of government schools.[16]

There was, apparently, no debate at the time, and no new committee was appointed to prepare a memorial on the subject of government recognition. But, as soon as the Edict of September 2, 1905, declared an end to the old Imperial Examination system, and a new type of Imperial Examination was under contemplation,[17] the question of government recognition of mission schools was immediately important.

"Foreign Schools" Seek Recognition. Beginning in September, 1905, and continuing throughout 1906, the topic of government recognition was an urgent one for missionary educators. If the government was now desirous of using men educated along Western lines, obviously the graduates of mission schools were qualified to compete and should not be discriminated against.[18] In progressive Kuangtung, one mission school achieved registration with the provincial authorities, but could make no headway with the authorities at Peking.[19] The principal, a German missionary, quoted the reply of the Viceroy of Canton as follows:

> If your school in its plan of instruction and in its whole character and spirit, is equal to the national institutions and if it will from time to time be visited and examined by the

> local mandarin, your students will be allowed to pass the examinations of the government.[20]

How, questioned the writer, could a Christian school be the same "in character and spirit" with a Confucian school? In his opinion, it was necessary for the EAC to take steps on behalf of mission schools to secure such recognition as would insure the future of their graduates. Either this, or that the various missions should, according to their nationality, put the matter before the Chinese government. His own preference was for the first procedure, but he left it to the EAC executive to decide which was best.[21]

This article is concluded with a paragraph from a Chinese newspaper, evidently in the more progressive school of thought in China, which declared that there was no reason why mission schools, which were giving a good thorough education, should not be recognized by the government and brought within government rules and regulations. As soon as the Ministry of Education is "reformed," it is intended that these mission schools shall be informed, through diplomatic channels, that they must submit to inspection, adopt the government's plan of instruction ("They may differ from it somewhat, but not very much"), after which their students will not be discriminated against.[22] This, of course, was exactly along the lines desired by the missionaries.

The month after this article was printed, the editor of the Educational Department, the Rev. A. S. Mann, of St. John's College, Shanghai, gave a résumé of the negotiations which had been going on between the executive of the EAC and the American minister, the Hon. W. W. Rockhill, as well as various individual actions.[23] He himself had written out a set of questions on the educational situation, and he printed these, together with the Minister's detailed replies.[24] The conclusion of the whole matter was that the Minister advised the EAC to decide what it wished to ask of the Chinese government, gave his own views as to what they should ask and expect, and offered his good services to bring about a conference.

> I have suggested that those concerned should express their willingness to have their schools inspected by the government authorities, and that, in return, they should ask that their pupils, who shall have completed the required course of studies, be allowed to take the examinations for degrees, on an equal footing with the students of the government schools, and that they be allowed to compete in the same way for official posts or other privileges. If your Educational Association can agree upon something of the sort, there is a possibility that something may be done. A representative committee should be sent to Peking to lay the matter before the national Board of Education. In case such action is taken, I shall be happy to approach the Board of Education and ask for such a conference, and I shall count it a privilege to do what I can to assist in making the conference a success.[25]

The hope was thus held out to missionary educators that government recognition might be secured in the near future.

The Government Distinguishes Between Chinese Christians and "Foreign" Schools. Eleven months later, Mr. Mann [26] had to report that nothing had come of all the efforts of the EAC. He wrote:

> As the readers of these columns [the Educational Department of which he was the editor] are aware, the Educational Association has made a definite effort to secure these privileges. A Committee of educators in and around Peking has been appointed, with instructions to confer with Mr. Rockhill, the American minister, who has kindly offered to co-operate in the movement, and through him to present their request to the Board of Education.

> This committee has prepared letters stating its case, which have been sent to the American and British ministers in Peking; but up to the present time they have reported no definite answer, and from the recent actions of the government it is clear that only negative results have been obtained.[27]

Without replying directly to the British and American ministers, the Board of Education made themselves clear. The opportunity to do this came when some schools in Fukien—it is not made clear exactly which schools—applied on their own initiative. The Board of Education was quoted in the *South China Journal*, October, 1906, as follows:

> The Board of Education in Peking has issued definite instructions to the effect that no mission or other schools controlled or established by foreigners will be allowed to be registered at the Board, nor recognition be vouchsafed to their graduates, on the ground that China does not wish to encourage foreign interference in her education, as it may have the effect of hindering the attainment of extraterritorial abolition.[28]

This rescript, Mr. Mann said, had been forwarded to the provinces, since when the mission schools—especially those which were not yet established—had suffered. Parents were unwilling to send their sons to schools whose graduates would be discriminated against.[29]

The reasons for this antagonism on the part of the Manchu government toward schools of Western learning established by foreigners while they were pushing their own schools to give this "Western learning" were the implications for extraterritoriality and the issue of Confucianism. One phase of the relationship between the Manchu dynasty and Confucianism as a state religion can be understood in terms of the institution of the monarchy in England and the Established Church. The one is dependent upon the other. So, in China, the Manchu dynasty was concerned for Confucianism as a bulwark to the Throne, and while it had been necessary to do away with the Imperial Examinations in order to establish the new school system, it became of more vital concern than ever to uphold Confucianism. Hence the clear statement of "Aims" by the new Board of Education early in 1906. (See last chapter.) And hence, also, the establishment of a "Confucian University" in the province of Shantung early in 1906. Mr. Mann points to this act as definite evidence that there was no hope of winning any concession "from the present administration," and concludes his account by saying that while there is nothing of direct applicability to mission schools in the decree concerning the founding of this University, yet

> it shows clearly that the time has not yet come for mission schools to be considered as an integral part of the educational system of the Empire; and so, without government assistance, we must again take up earnestly our work of battering at the ignorance, blindness, and folly of this vast nation.[30]

It would have been more true to facts to say "the ignorance, blindness, and folly of this Manchu dynasty." But that, of course, would have been *lèse majesté*.

While the Chinese government was asserting itself against interference in its educational program by Westerners, in its relationships with its own subjects, it displayed great tolerance. Men trained in Western countries were needed to represent China abroad. Accordingly, in the fall of 1906, when, for the second time, Imperial Examinations were held in Peking for returned students from Europe, America, and Japan, no inquiry, W. W. Yen states, was made as to religious beliefs. The highest degree in the land, "practically speaking" Dr. Yen said, was conferred on eight men whose chief claim to that honor was that they held diplomas from Western universities.[31]

After 1906, there was no further effort to force from an unwilling Manchu government a recognition that they were plainly averse to conceding. Had there been any inclination to bring diplomatic pressure to bear, the Centenary Conference, in May, 1907, would have provided the occasion. Perhaps the clear recognition of the growing revolutionary movement at that time and the difficulties of the government, both of which factors were reverse sides of the same thing, inclined the wisest of the missionary body to hold back.[32]

EDUCATIONAL TRENDS, 1902-1909

The main educational trends in the years lying between the Fourth Triennial in 1902 and the Sixth Triennial in 1909—the latter was postponed a year because of the Centenary Conference in 1907—were expansion of educational work, united effort in educational work, the rise of the regional associations, the increased concern with the teaching of English, and the trend away from the writing of textbooks. A last trend, and a dubious one, is Romanization.

Expansion of Educational Work. The opportunities were so great in the years after the failure of the counter-revolution that despite the growth in institutions, in pupils, in staff, between 1902 and 1909, the Centenary Conference passed this resolution:

> Whereas, The opportunities for Christian educational work have greatly increased in the last few years, owing to the reforms taking place in China, and whereas, this demand for enlightenment seems to constitute a distinct call from God to the Christian church,
>
> Resolved:- That we urge upon the home churches, through the Boards of Missions, the necessity of developing

> the secondary or high schools and colleges already existing, and the founding of new ones where none have been established; that we ask for more liberal support for this educational work, not only as regards money but also as regards the number of men and women assigned to take part in it; inasmuch as we consider that the effort now being put forth is in no sense commensurate with the opportunities at our door, and realize that unless we seize upon the opportunities as they arise, we may lose them altogether.[33]

The greatness of the opportunities and the inability of any one mission adequately to meet them caused the missionaries to continue to draw together in educational work.

United Effort in Educational Work. The steady growth in the membership of the EAC is proof of the missionary urge to united effort. This growth is shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Year	*Triennial*	*Membership*	*Missionary Body*	*Chinese Membership*
1890		37	*ca.* 1300	
1893	First	73	1324	
1896	Second	138		2
1899	Third	189		1
1902	Fourth	249	2000 (?)	1
1905	Fifth	383	3500 (?)	2
1909	Sixth	490	4299	9

After 1902, more than a tenth of the missionary body held membership in the Educational Association.

Halfway in the period 1902-1909, the Fifth Triennial met and reported:

> The growth of our work makes it more and more apparent that the Association needs a home of its own . . . where

> we can keep our books and papers, hold our committee meetings, collect and keep on exhibition books and other educational appliances for the convenience and assistance of our members and patrons, and where we can place the library already accumulated.
>
> The general willingness on the part of our members and others to respond to our requests for assistance is very gratifying, and has helped greatly to lighten the work . . . and yet . . . the business of the Association is rapidly becoming a burden too great to be borne by those whose other duties demand all the time at their command. There is an urgent need for a secretary who can give his whole time to the work. . . .[34]

The Association had begun on a voluntary basis, and was growing beyond the capacity of missionaries who had full-time responsibilities in their several missions. At the Sixth Triennial (1909), Mr. Silsby reported in the same tenor. For eighteen years the work had been growing until it was no longer possible to carry it on a voluntary basis. He said:

> The Centenary Conference held at Shanghai in May, 1907, approved the plans of the Educational Association's Executive Committee, and placed on record its belief that a General Secretary would be able "to render a very helpful and necessary service to the whole missionary body and to the cause of Christ throughout the Empire."
>
> The Centenary Missionary Conference approved the Educational Association's plan to raise $10,000 gold, or £2000 per annum for its work, and this sum the committee considered sufficient to carry on effectively the greatly enlarged work which the Association desires to undertake. . . . At this crisis of opportunity . . . when the whole empire is wonderfully open to new educational influences and is especially favorable to the friendly co-operation of American and English teachers, a great work can be done.

> . . . As the Association is interdenominational and international, it asks for help without regard to sectarian or national affiliations. Surely there are men . . . who will be glad to help in raising the funds needed for this work.[35]

Mr. Silsby was a voice crying in the wilderness. A cynical critic of Christianity might say that a work which was "interdenominational and international," so far from appealing to worshipers of one God, was the one cause to which they would not contribute.

The trend toward united work in education was not limited to the Educational Association. The Shantung Christian College, representing a merger of several institutions belonging to different missions dates back to this period.[36] In Chihli, the "North China Educational Union" was the result of the Boxer year which threw all mission work in that area into confusion and destitution.[37] For these years, the several institutions in the Union worked in different localities—the Liberal Arts, Medical, Theological, Women's College, *et al*[38]—but this beginning of co-operation prepared the way for the later emergence of Yenching University. Efforts in West China at this time, too, resulted in the West China Union University in 1910.[39] About the time of the Centenary Conference, there was the projected Union University, outlined by Dr. Pott in his address on that occasion,[40] and discussed again at the Sixth Triennial in 1909, but destined to come to nothing as a result of our "unhappy divisions."

Another united project that resulted from the Centenary Conference was the formation of the China Sunday School Union. In 1910, the Rev. E. G. Tewksbury was secured as General Secretary, a position which he held for some three decades. Mr. Tewksbury was highly regarded in both missionary and Chinese Christian circles as a speaker, thinker, and editor, and did pioneer work in teacher training in China. Books on educational method came from the press of the

China Sunday School Union, as well as the Uniform Sunday School Lessons and some graded courses. The Uniform Lessons are still used by some churches in China today.[41]

The Rise of Regional Associations. The rise of regional associations in these years is another manifestation of the trend toward union in educational work. Just as the EAC had been brought into existence in the first instance to end a period of isolation, so the educational missionaries—who were increasing—felt the need, as they met at summer resorts, to come together and discuss their common problems, work out curricula, and prepare uniform examinations. As these associations were on a voluntary basis, not requiring funds from the sending countries, they were successfully achieved, as the EAC had been in the beginning. The three oldest regional associations were: the Educational Association of Fukien established in 1905; [42] the West China Christian Educational Union, in 1907; [43] and the Educational Association of Canton, in 1909.[44]

The Question of English. The great expansion of missionary education in these years was largely due to the desire of the Chinese for a knowledge of English. The missionaries began to prepare series of English texts.[45] An editorial in 1903 says that the topic "Shall we teach English?" has been replaced by "How shall we teach English?" [46] and again:

> Formerly hours and days were spent discussing whether we should or should not teach English, but there is no discussion on this question now. English must be taught whether we will or no.[47]

The Trend Away From the Preparation of Chinese Textbooks. The trend toward the teaching of English was accompanied by a trend away from the writing of Chinese textbooks. The textbooks and treatises and translations of Western literature made in the nineteenth century by the

School and Textbook Series Committee and later by the Publication Committee of the EAC met an undoubted need. The Commerical Press appeared in 1898, and other Chinese concerns dealing with the publication of educational and scientific works came after that. Table 11, giving the book sales between 1877 and 1909 illustrates the rise and the beginning of the decline—which proceeded much more rapidly than the rise—of the role of the missionary as a writer of textbooks.[48]

TABLE 11

Record of Book Sales, 1877-1909

Years	*Book Sales*	
1877-1890	$ 6,299.57	
1890-1893	1,572.99	
1893-1896	2,630.80	
1896-1899	4,549.46	
1899-1902	13,788.37	(Despite counter-
1902-1905	27,050.97	Revolution)
1905-1909	22,176.11	

Note: Although the report of sales was made in May of each of these trienniums, the fiscal year ended on December 31 of the preceding year.

The School and Textbook Series Committee reported 129 volumes (fewer titles) to the Conference of 1890, which would mean an average of nine a year, and all but two of those were produced by missionaries. In contrast, the Publications Committee reported a total of fourteen volumes in 1905 and ten in 1909—four of these latter were by Chinese—or twenty-four volumes in seven years. Twenty were by missionaries, making an average of three a year.[49]

Romanization. At first glance, it appears that Romanization was a major concern of educational missionaries between

1902 and 1905. A more careful examination of the *Chinese Recorder,* however, will reveal that Romanization was a major interest of Mr. Silsby, who was the editor of the Educational Department in these years. Only one title connected with the topic among a total of twenty-eight or twenty-nine between 1902 and 1909 falls outside the period of Mr. Silsby's editorship.

CHINESE PARTICIPATION IN MISSIONARY EDUCATION

Textbooks. There is a curious similarity between the stages of the missionary educator's development and that of the Chinese educator. The missionary was first teacher; then, after 1877, textbook writer; and, after 1895, he was increasingly concerned with school administration. The first Chinese names to stand out in the small educational world under review are the names of authors: the Rev. Y. K. Yen, as a member of the School and Textbook Series Committee, 1886-1890; P. N. Tsu, also of St. John's, who prepared a geography of the Chinese Empire in 1898, in English; and then, beginning in 1901, Wang Hang-t'ung, a prolific writer for the next decade; Liu Gwang-djao (Kwang-chao); Zia Hang-lai; Sz Tsu-p'ing; and others. Most of these Chinese Christian teachers published on their own account, and not through the Publications Committee.[50] Three of the ten books listed by the Publications Committee in 1909, however, were by Professor Liu Kwang-chao of whom the report said:

> We are exceedingly glad that educated Chinese have taken up the work of authorship, and we hope that as time goes on many more books will be written by such men as Professor Liu Gwang-djao. We call special attention to his excellent arithmetics and geometry.[51]

Status of the Chinese Teacher. Aside from the notices in the Educational Department during these years of new books by Chinese teachers—readers, geographies, arithmetics, and so on—and the one article by Dr. Yen on the Imperial Examinations of 1906, there are no Chinese names known to us. Eight tenths of the teachers in the missionary institutions, however, were Chinese, according to Dr. Bergen, President of Shantung Christian College, in a paper, "Status of Chinese Teachers in Mission Schools," read before the Fifth Triennial of the EAC in 1905:

> Some of us have had experiences with these men which might almost make us wish to change the topic to "the status of foreign missionaries in mission schools." The brilliant achievements of some of our Chinese make us humble, and we ruminate (rather uncomfortably): who are we to fix the status of our peers?
>
> This paper will be a plea for Chinese teachers. . . . They are doing possibly eight tenths of the actual classroom work in the cause of Christian education. They are the intellectual guides and frequently the spiritual fathers of a host of young Chinese who are the promise of the future church. . . . After looking through the minutes of past conferences and perusing the oft-repeated refrain over the inefficiency of our Chinese colleagues, I am convinced that it will not be wholly unprofitable for us, by way of variety, to discourse on their merits, to call to mind their tedious labors and their insignificant rewards.[52]

Following this introduction, the topic of status is taken up. Certain principles, the writer said, hold good for the entire class. The first of these is the "inevitable subordination" of the Chinese teacher to the foreign missionary, a fact that works peculiar hardship, but which may not be avoided, for

> as long as school and teacher are supported by mission funds, just so long and perhaps longer, will authority rest with the missionary.[53]

In contrast, there is the status of the missionary, commissioned by his society, entrusted with funds for disbursement, having power to engage and dismiss Chinese teachers and the final word in all regulations of the school.

> In short, through the money power he has his Chinese staff completely under his control, subject to the rules of his mission.[54]

This state of affairs is justified because, while the Chinese teacher may have a long teaching experience back of him, and the foreign teacher may never have taught at all, the missionary

> has not only money but knowledge, initiative, devotion, and courage, and pursues his work with all Christendom behind him.[55]

Having fixed the status of the two dramatis personae, the relationships are discussed. Although the missionary has this authority, he must be prudent in its exercise. Employers in the West find that it is profitable to have contented employees and that expenditures "beyond the bond" bring in rich returns. Here we see how the general view of China held by the West influences missionary thought and action:

> The fact that we hold the purse strings and are dealing with men in our employ who belong to a decadent civilization inevitably makes us autocratic to the verge of tyranny unless we faithfully examine ourselves.[56]

In one respect, the Chinese teacher had an advantage over the Chinese clergyman. The founding of a national system of schools put a premium upon the man who could teach Western subjects. This acted to raise the salary of the teacher in the mission school, even though the mission school could not compete.

> The government schools, in their eagerness to secure the best men and to dignify the office, have placed salaries at a figure which strikes us as extravagant. Several of the graduates of the college with which I am connected, are now receiving salaries of from forty to eighty taels a month for less work than they were doing for from eight to fifteen taels. But I am glad to report that such rise does not appear to have had a damaging effect on the character of the men of some experience. They dress well and live well, but they have also . . . maintained their connection with the church.[57]

The writer even admits to "a thrill of satisfaction" that these former colleagues are on an easier financial footing, while still doing the work for which they were trained, and are not debarred from giving their Christian testimony.[58] He displays his rearing in a capitalist civilization when he urges that missionaries avoid even the appearance of bidding against each other for the services of the best men, "even while we cannot organize into a trust for keeping down wages." [59]

On the subject of social position, Dr. Bergen affirms what the Chinese affirmed a decade later; that the teacher in a mission school was "in practice . . . not seldom relegated to the place of superior coolie." [60]

CHAPTER V

Revolution and Renaissance, 1909-1919

FROM EMPIRE TO REPUBLIC

THE revolutionary propaganda had proceeded so far by 1909 that it was apparent the Manchu regime could not long continue. In 1910, the National Assembly held its first session and greatly impressed Westerners in Peking. One of these wrote:

> Politically, great changes have taken place. . . . Besides the Provincial Assemblies . . . the National Assembly has held its first session. . . . It was an experiment, without administrative powers, to prepare the way for the future Imperial Parliament, but it awakened the thought of the world by the order and dignity that characterized its proceedings and its advocacy of the most drastic reforms, as well as by the boldness with which it criticised long-established customs and inefficient methods of administration, and especially its denunciation of the Grand Council for incompetency.
>
> The conservatism of the old-time officials is still very strong in the counsels of state, yet the progressiveness of the

> large numbers of young men who have been educated in modern schools and in western lands is a powerful leaven that will inevitably introduce a new order.[1]

Such changes, political, social, and material, had taken place by 1910 that when the revolutionary change finally occurred on October 10, 1911, the statement was made in November of that year that

> the people are so overwhelmingly and enthusiastically in favor of the new regime that, with the possible exception of Peking, a corporal's guard could capture almost any city in the Empire. The Government seems to recognize that resistance is hopeless and has appointed Yüan Shih-k'ai, Viceroy of Hukwang, with power to treat for peace.[2]

But the Republic, although safely delivered from the womb of time and greeted with enthusiasm, had yet a puling infancy to live through. Dr. Arthur H. Smith wrote in 1912:

> Although the Chinese cannot possibly have a "Republic" at present, they may have something which they call a republic, and which may ultimately develop into such. The intermediate stages must be those of an oligarchy under republican forms and titles.[3]

What actually happened was that Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary movement, which overthrew the Manchu dynasty, was not strong enough to reap the fruits of its victory. The conservatives, aided and abetted by the powers, upheld Yüan Shih-k'ai, the head of the army (or was it Yüan Shih-k'ai who upheld the conservatives?) and Yüan Shih-k'ai, who was a conservative at heart, did all in his power to establish a dynasty and return to the old ways. He died, disappointed, in 1916, and the struggle between Sun Yat-sen's Kuomintang

(People's Party) in the South and the inheritors of the old Manchu regime in the North continued.

Repercussions of World War I

Meantime, in 1914, World War I began and Japan quickly took over from Germany in Shantung. Not content with this, it made the "Twenty-one Demands" upon China, thereby providing China with its "Humiliation Day" observed annually thereafter by patriotic and anti-Japanese rallies.[4] China's best hope of winning Shantung back and otherwise securing redress from Japan's encroachments, was to join the war on the side of the Allies. This it did, sending Labor Battalions to the European war theatre and hoping for justice at the Peace Table. While differing on almost everything else, both North and South were in perfect accord in the matter of entering the War. Unfortunately for China's cause at Versailles, the pro-Japanese premier under Yüan Shih-k'ai, Tuan Ch'i-jui, had been willing to give Japan special rights in China in return for huge loans with which to fight the Kuomintang. In a document signing away railroad rights, he had expressed "pleasure" in handing them over. The Allies argued that since this was the case, he had not acted under compulsion. Chinese delegates protested in vain that the word was a mere formality.[5] Japan was confirmed in its position in Shantung, and when this word came to China, disappointment and anger swept the country. There resulted the great nation-wide student demonstration and the launching of the Patriotic Movement in the spring of 1919, bringing, as an immediate result, the resignation of certain officials and, eventually, the development of nationalism to such an extent that important changes were brought about in the 1920's in China's relations with the Western powers.

The new temper which manifested itself in the Patriotic Movement in 1919 was the result of various influences. One of these was the spectacle of the Western powers in fratricidal strife. Of the effect of World War I on the Chinese, Dr. Hu Shih said:

> The European war with its awful destruction has disclosed the true note of western civilization. The Chinese have come to a better understanding of western nations; and our fear of them has gradually disappeared. During the War (1914-18) there were great changes in international commerce, with a rapid growth in Chinese production and a temporary decline of western exploitation and oppression in the Far East.[6]

Beginnings of Industrialization

Machine production began to make itself felt in China, bringing in its train the same suffering which had been brought to England a century earlier. Mills were set up to weave foreign-style cloth and the old home-made cloth seemed coarse in comparison. A literal translation of a modern poem dating from this period runs:

SONG OF THE CLOTH SELLER

Big Sister weaves cloth,
Big Brother sells cloth,
    Sells cloth and buys rice
    To fill their stomachs.

. . .

Home-made cloth coarse;
Foreign cloth fine.
Foreign cloth cheap.
The rich man likes it.
Home-made cloth nobody wants.
Starving! Brother and sister.[7]

Or, again:

SPEED UP

Speed up! Work!
From dawn to dark.
Fourteen hours, fifteen hours.
Speed up! Speed up!

Speed up—to Age!—to Want!—to Death!
Speed up! Speed up!
Break the chains from around the neck of the labourer!
Burst the prison built by the Capitalist!
What is real civilization?
Take it and grind it to nothingness!

. . .

Use your strength with all boldness,
Flowers of the heart's reddest!
Speed up! Speed up! [8]

The appearance of such verse in a volume entitled "New Poetry," with an Introduction by Hu Shih, was an evidence of the Chinese Renaissance.

The Renaissance or New Civilization Movement

The years 1915-1919 found China still politically disunited, but in an intellectual ferment of a different sort from the ferment following 1895. Then, an ancient civilization was awakening to a need for change. Now, a civilization was receiving back her sons, the "returned students," described in 1910 as "advance waves of a dimly understood civilization," [9] who were to prove in a few years to have been the advance waves of what was called the "New Tide Movement" in Chinese, or the "New Civilization Movement," and, in English, the Renaissance, or New Thought Movement. Termed by one Chinese as "a product of the Age," [10] the New Thought Movement was just that: the inevitable re-evaluation of their own great civilization by those who had experienced other civilizations. They saw with fresh eyes. They returned from the West with new measures of evaluation for their own literature, philosophy, and art.

The New Civilization Movement [11] stemmed from three sources. The first in point of time was a society of returned students, the *Shang Chih Hsueh Hui*, organized in Peking in 1910. His Excellency, Fan Yuan Lien, was a leading figure in this society.

> Its chief object was to promote the new learning. It is one of the few such organizations that has any endowment. . . . Minister Fan left the cabinet and made a trip to Europe and America. There, as I understand it, he conceived the idea of inviting scholars from Europe and America to be annual lecturers. On his return a definite plan was launched. John Dewey of Columbia was the first appointee, and Bertrand Russell of Cambridge, the second. . . .[12]

The second source was the group gathered around Chancellor Ts'ai Yuan-pei, a distinguished Chinese scholar at the National University of Peking recently returned from a sojourn in France and Germany. He was Minister of Education for a brief time in the first cabinet under the Republic, he then accepted the post of chancellor of the University and became the center of a group of choice spirits and scholars, including many returned students from Europe, America, and Japan. It was to this faculty that Hu Shih came upon his return from study abroad.[13]

The third source, and that which ushered in the Movement, was the magazine, *La Jeunesse*. It began, Dr. Lew says, as an insignificant paper, discussing all sorts of problems—"political, economic, social, but chiefly literary"—in 1915.[14]

> Chen Tu-siu (hsiu) was its leading figure. Soon Dr. Suh Hu's (Hu Shih's) name appeared on its pages; later many others. This magazine ran through seven volumes and has been recognized as the dynamo which generated the power of this movement.[15]

Of all the names associated with the Movement, Hu Shih's stands first. In the controversy over the use of the spoken language, the *pai hua*, as a literary vehicle, the party led by Dr. Hu Shih was victorious, and he, in consequence, became known as the "Father of the Renaissance." [16]

Following 1915, numerous societies sprang up: the Young China Society, the Co-operative Society, the Philosophical Society, and so on. Some of these translated realistic French and Russian drama or novels; some, Marxist writings.[17] All placed emphasis upon science and democracy. Political views might differ, but there was oneness as to the necessity for democracy.[18]

The use of the spoken language as a literary vehicle resulted in a flood of periodicals and books, bringing into China ideas from all over the world. Within four years after the appearance of *La Jeunesse*, there were a hundred and forty new periodicals.[19] Along with the enthusiasm for things new, there was a new interest in studying old things with a new critical method. Such a movement was not without repercussions on education.

EDUCATION

The national system of schools was hampered from the earliest beginnings by activities in connection with the revolution. These activities increased with the years, and it is amazing that any progress was made at all. When the fighting started at Wuchang in October, 1911, schools suffered. Yet, just because of the importance attached to the new schools in connection with making China a first-class power, one of the first acts of the Provisional Government set up at Nanking was to convene an educational conference (January, 1912) in order to plan an educational system in harmony with the ideals of the new republic. The plans made at this conference were doomed to come to nothing, for Sun Yat-sen resigned the presidency of the Republic to Yüan Shih-k'ai in February. But Yüan Shih-k'ai called an educational conference in July, representative of all China and of Mongolia and Tibet as well, when the system of 1903 was modified in favor of the system of 1912.[20] Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei was the new Minister of Education at this time, which accounts in part for the changes. The system of 1912 showed more European and less Japanese influence than the system of 1903.[21]

For a time after this, government education seemed to languish. Some of the provincial colleges opened after 1902 were closed, and mission secondary schools and colleges were crowded with students. This seeming retrogression was explained by Dr. Fong in 1914 as follows:

> Though it is true that, since the political chaos . . . education in China has suffered a relapse, yet these are but half-truths. In the reorganization of the school system of the country, the emphasis has been shifted from institutions of higher learning to elementary education. This accounted for the closing of some of the provincial colleges and colleges of foreign languages.[22]

Here was a reversal of policy, not in the sense of turning backward, but in the sense of being more truly modern, of laying stronger educational foundations. Cyrus H. Peake points out that although Yüan Shih-k'ai was a conservative in the matter of preferring a monarchy to a republic, he was very modern in his ideas as to patriotism and the duty of the individual to the state.[23] Despite all political upheavals, Hollington K. Tong was able to report in *La Jeunesse* (June, 1915) that the number of schools in China was nearly doubled over the figures of October, 1911, and that it was estimated that one person in fifty received the rudiments of an education in 1914 as against one person in 400 in 1911, the last year of the Ch'ing dynasty.[24] What these figures portended, we will let the government educator, Fong, say:

> These facts and figures indicate that remarkable progress has been made in our national education during recent years. It is all the more remarkable when we remember that . . . the government was busy putting down rebel activities, restoring order, and paying foreign loans, with little money to spare for education. They show that our people are beginning to understand the close relation between democracy and education, and give hope for the future.[25]

If Dr. Fong was able to report so much progress in 1915, the year which saw the birth of the New Civilization Movement, it is not surprising that there was far greater progress between 1915 and 1919, under the direct stimulus of this Movement. Dr. Kuo, in January, 1919, cited substantial gains in the five years just passed: five great national conferences had been convened by the Ministry of Education between 1914 and 1919 which had achieved much "toward the unification of ideas and standardization of methods;" [26] great progress had been made in teacher training and the improvement of teachers in service; in the certification of primary-school teachers; in the vocational educational movement; the athletic movement; the movement for public playgrounds; the movement for the reduction of illiteracy; and so on. He reported the three principal trends as toward universal education, physical education, and vocational education.[27] It was in these years that government education overtook and passed mission educational work in China.

In short, these were the years which saw the beginning of changes equivalent in significance to the European Renaissance, the Reformation, or the Industrial Revolution—changes which in the West came about slowly, covering centuries, but which, in China, were compressed into decades. Moreover, political upheavals comparable to the French Revolution were taking place in a world setting far more complex than that of any previous period in the history of mankind.

Changes in the Christian Community

The small but growing Christian community was shaken by the happenings in the outer world. A missionary returning to Canton in 1909 from a furlough of a little more than a year was impressed by the changes which had occurred during his absence. These changes, he said, were in every sphere, but he limited his account "in a limitless field" to the changed attitude of the Chinese pastor.

> Once the preacher was the employee of the missionary; today he is the co-labourer. The change has not been in the missionary; at least not wholly. It is one of the effects upon the preacher of the changing times. . . . The missionary . . . and the preacher may now discuss and plan work upon an entirely new basis. . . . Then he spake and it was done; now he confers, gives a why and a wherefore. . . .
>
> Self-government and self-support—here we have an echo of the self-government spirit abroad in the land. Fortunately, this spirit of independence has . . . had a healthy effect upon the church. The people feel . . . that the church must keep pace with the independence of spirit shown in commercial affairs.[28]

Kenneth Scott Latourette sets 1914 as the date when the Chinese were ceasing to be subservient to the foreigner and were beginning to display "independent initiative." [29] This date would be correct for China as a whole. Changes started at Canton and moved northward.

One index of the change in the Christian community is the increase of articles by Chinese in the *Chinese Recorder.* As against five articles written by Chinese for the *Chinese Recorder* and six translations of Chinese articles by missionaries, eleven in all, in the ten years, 1900-1909, there were fifty-one in the ten years, 1910-1919. Of these fifty-one, fourteen appeared in 1919. It is true that the editorial board of the *Chinese Recorder,* in the latter years of this period, adopted the policy of seeking Chinese contributions, but this policy reflected the change in the status of the Chinese and in the increase of the number of Chinese Christians educated abroad. Seven of the fifty-one articles were by Cheng Ching-yi (C. Y.), outstanding leader of the Chinese Christian Movement, nurtured in the mission which had sent the first Protestant missionary to China. Other articles were contributed by four brilliant young men of the Sheng Kung Hui (Anglican Communion), three of them sons of clergy—C. T. Wang, David Z. T. Yui, and Y. Y. Tsu—and the fourth, Francis C. M. Wei, a former student at Boone University, Wuchang. These write on church problems such as self-support, social applications of Christianity, and the philosophical aspects of Christianity. Other Chinese contributors were Dr. Fong F. Sec and Dr. Kuo, who wrote on education, and H. C. Mei, who wrote a forceful article on "The Returned Student in China." [30] One article dealt with the attitude of the Chinese press toward Christianity, some twenty others (five of them by women) dealt with special aspects of church work, Sunday School, missions, woman's work, and the like.

Such progress in the adjustment of relationships between missionaries and Chinese co-workers had come about by 1919 that J. Leighton Stuart wrote:

> The inclusion of Chinese on boards of control and committees of all types, the insistence on Chinese leadership wherever possible, the increasing respect given the opinion of Chinese workers, the instinctive treatment of Chinese associates, especially by the younger missionaries, as social equals and comrades in service, are some of the notable indications of the new order.[31]

This reference to the younger missionaries reflects a new attitude developing among students in Western countries against "imperialism" and race discrimination. These were the years when the "Y" Committees of Friendly Relations with Foreign Students and Cosmopolitan Clubs began, and when, in the shared interests and activities of these and other student organizations future missionaries and Chinese achieved a comradeship that was unknown in the earlier days, except, perhaps, in the case of some exceptional missionaries.[32] The Chinese Christian Association of North America, which also began about this time, also proved a valuable training experience for future Christian leaders in China, both in Christian and government schools.

CHAPTER VI

Expansion and Reorganization of Missionary Education, 1909-1919

Expansion

MISSION schools were able to expand during these years immediately preceding and following the establishment of the Republic, because, while the Chinese government schools were handicapped by revolutionary activities, the mission schools, protected by extra-territoriality, had an increasing income and constantly increasing educational reinforcements of trained personnel from the West. Dr. Fong F. Sec wrote in 1915:

> However much the government may feel it to be their duty to give the people a common education, lack of funds is crippling the existing institutions. This embarrassment of the government institutions presents a magnificent opportunity to the mission schools.[1]

Mission schools were increasing in numbers, and also in staff, both Western and Chinese. Some 2300 new missionaries arrived in China between 1909 and 1919, bringing the number from 4299 in 1909 to 6636 in 1919. (See Appendix A.) The same article continues by paying tribute to the improved quality of education in these institutions.

> There are no better schools and colleges in the land than the Christian schools and colleges. They are superior to others especially in their good discipline and influence upon the character of the students. The fact that more and more educational experts are being sent out . . . has not a little to do with the strong position which missionary institutions occupy today.[2]

Another thousand or more missionaries entered China after this appraisal was written, and the number of Chinese men teachers in mission schools increased from six to nine thousand between 1915 and 1920, while the number of women teachers rose from 2500 to 3500 in the same years.[3] Middle schools increased from 216 to 231 and colleges decreased from twenty-four to sixteen. This meant that when stricter standards were applied, some so-called colleges were eliminated. Elementary schools rose from approximately five to seven thousand.[4] This expansion, however, must have been too rapid and unplanned, or else the improvement of the situation in government education made what had seemed good in 1915 seem less so in 1919, for Dr. Kuo, who had taken his degree in education at Columbia University—his dissertation was published in 1915—reported on progress in government education in that year, and uttered a word of warning to mission educators.

> Toward this forward movement in educational reconstruction, the Christian educational force in China can play an important part, but the measure of success is to be determined by the efficiency of Christian education. . . .

> The future program of Christian education must include a scheme for closer union and more effective co-operation so that Christian education may present a united front to the public. It must also . . . call . . . leaders who have had professional training in modern theory and methods of education to take the place of the amateur educators that constitute a large portion of the Christian educational force. Adequate provision must be made for the training of teachers and their improvement in service; in both directions they are far behind what the government is doing. . . .[5]

"Closer union" and "more effective co-operation" in order to present a "united front" was exactly what the educational missionaries had struggled in vain to achieve against the complacency of the supporting boards a decade earlier. There had been expansion and some improvement in the separate missions, but effective union work had to be done mainly through voluntary associations of busy missionaries, such as, the regional educational associations.

Reorganization of the EAC

Regional Associations and the Advisory Council. Regional associations were first organized in 1905. They came into being, just as the EAC had originally done, to meet the needs of missionary educators in a given region. There were three such in 1909, and a paper on the subject of the need for local associations, written by a Canton member in 1902, was reprinted in 1909.[6] In 1911, the Central China Christian Educational Union, including the missionaries from Hupeh, Hunan, Anhui, and Kiangi, was organized.[7] These associations were concerned with course of study, curriculum, textbooks, standardization, teacher training, and kindred subjects. They differed among themselves; some, notably West China, Fukien, and Central China were enthusiasts for "uniform examinations,"[8] while others, Kwangtung and

East China, worked for higher salaries for teachers as a means of upgrading standards.[9] East China and Kwangtung Christian Educational Associations had the advantage of some English-speaking Chinese members,[10] while the Shantung-Honan Christian Educational Association boasted that theirs was the one Association in which the official language was Chinese.[11] The last triennial meeting under the old organization of the EAC was the seventh, convened in 1912. It is an interesting coincidence that both the government and missionary systems of education, launched at the same time, should have found themselves compelled at the same time—for different reasons, of course—to effect a reorganization. Little was heard of government education between 1912 and 1914, and equally little was heard of missionary education.[12] Mr. Silsby, who had been loaned by his Board on a part-time basis, edited the last issue of the *Educational Review*, at that time a monthly, in December, 1911, before his departure on furlough, and the next issue, a quarterly, appeared in December, 1913, two years later, under the editorship of the new full-time general secretary, Frank D. Gamewell, whose services were given by the Methodist Episcopal Board.

The general plan of the new organization was adopted at the Seventh Triennial Meeting of the EAC in 1912, and the details were worked out at the first meeting of the Advisory Council in May, 1914. This meeting was attended by representatives from the eight regions into which China had been districted. Five of these districts had, by 1914, effected organizations, while the former EAC members in the three districts not yet organized chose representatives from among themselves.[13] The Advisory Council was composed of three representatives from each of the eight districts, together with certain co-opted members, and with the general secretary *ex officio*. The order of the day called for reports from the general secretary and from each of the affiliated associations. Out of the discussion of these reports there grew the

"Recommendations" of the Advisory Council which were then carried back into the regional associations, studied, and acted upon. In this way, there was a constant interchange of ideas. The records of these annual meetings are found in the July issues of the *Educational Review* between 1914 and 1927.

The Change of Name. The old name, "Educational Association of China," was finally, after lengthy debate, changed in 1915 to the "China Christian Educational Association" and was assumed with the January issue of the *Educational Review,* 1916. This change was a very belated recognition of what some educational missionaries had felt for a decade or more, that the name, Educational Association of China, was a very inappropriate one, especially after the government inaugurated its scheme of national education in 1902.[14]

The Educational Review. The *Educational Review,* in addition to keeping a record of the annual proceedings of the Advisory Council also published, with greater or less regularity, the records of the annual meetings of the regional associations. The East China Christian Educational Association held its annual meeting at the spring vacation, China New Year, and the report is always found in the April issue of the *Review.* The Central China Christian Educational Association, the Fukien, and, later, others which met in the summer, had their reports in the October issue. Some associations, whether due to distance, (West China, Manchuria), or to constant political storms (in Kwangtung), were less regular with their annual reports, which appeared in any one of the four issues or, indeed, sometimes failed to appear at all.

In addition to the records of annual meetings, national and regional, the papers read at those meetings were often given to a wider audience as articles in the *Educational Review.* Other articles were written especially for the *Review,* and reports of significant developments in health education, tests and measurements, home economics, and numerous other topics will be found in this well-edited journal. There are also scattered through the years a goodly number of articles by the staff of Teachers College: William F. Russell,[15] Paul Monroe,[16] William A. McCall,[17] T. H. P. Sailer, whose articles on books by Dewey and Thorndike and others began in 1911, were resumed in 1914 (after the two-year break in the continuity of the magazine) and continued for a score of years.[18]

This, in brief, was the framework of the missionary system of education which developed between 1909 and 1919, a natural outgrowth of the preceding period. It was not, as its original name proclaimed, "The Educational Association of China;" nor was it in reality what its new name proclaimed after 1915, the China Christian Educational Association. The realities of the situation were better described by Dr. Pott who favored the name "The Missionary Educational Association of China" as "an accurate description" [19] or, as D. L. Anderson had witheringly described it, "The Educational Association of the Foreign Missionaries representing the Protestant Churches in China."[20] Yet, within the educational institutions of the missions there were being nurtured the Chinese who would eventually take over Christian education and make an Educational Association which should be both Chinese and Christian. Chinese were seldom found in the Association meetings, but beginning in 1909, the Chinese Christian teacher began to make himself heard.

Chinese Participation in Missionary Education

Chinese Ask a Share in Christian Education. The new spirit which was rising in China in 1909 evidenced itself by a communication, "Appeal from Chinese Educationists." [21] The document came from a Chinese group, presumably clergy, possibly including lay educators also, and was addressed to the Sixth Triennial of the Educational Association meeting in Shanghai in May, 1909. It asked for a share in the direction of educational policy, and was the first such request ever to come before the EAC. The Chinese membership had never exceeded two per cent of the total membership in the EAC, as Table 12 will show.[22]

TABLE 12

Chinese Membership in the EAC, 1890-1909

Year	*Triennial*	*Total Membership*	*Chinese Membership*
1890		35	
1893	First	73	
1896	Second	138	2 (Mr. C. P. Hu (Rev. Y. K. Yen
1899	Third	189	1 Mr. C. P. Hu
1902	Fourth	249	1 Prof. W. W. Yen
1905	Fifth	383	2 *See Note 22
1907			4 *See Note 22
1909	Sixth	490	9 *See Note 22

From the tone and certain internal evidence in the "Appeal from Chinese Educationists," it seems to have been written by ministers rather than by the lay educators, and by persons outside the EAC rather than by the nine Chinese members of the Association, a rather elite group, English-speaking, and some of them possessed of private means. The "Appeal" outlined an eminently practical plan for "a joint Christian Educational Association" (note the name) in which the Chinese and foreign missionaries (note the order) may work for the correlation of the education of church schools (they do not use the term "mission schools") and national education.

> Let the Chinese and foreign missionaries form a joint Christian Educational Association for the purpose of promoting and correlating our national education and the education of our church schools.

METHOD OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

1. Establish headquarters in the city of Shanghai.
2. Curriculum–Special and general courses of study to be made to correspond to those prescribed by the government.
3. Diplomas and degrees– . . .
4. Officers. Several individuals will be selected by a general vote to form a central committee. The salaries of this committee shall be paid by the Association. Subcommittees at other places shall serve gratis.
5. Magazine– . . .
6. Duties– . . .
7. Support– . . .[23]

Missionary Response to Chinese Request. The reply of the Triennial expressed appreciation for the courteous tone of the communication, and, after replying to the first issue raised, (government recognition), continued: (Author's italics)

> As to the second item, we are in hearty sympathy with your request, and take the opportunity to invite and earnestly urge all Chinese Christian educationists to participate with us on equal terms in all the privileges and responsibilities of *our* Educational Association, and we have made certain changes in *our* Constitution to further this end.[24]

Regarding the specific suggestions for a headquarters, salaried officers, and so on, the reply came:

> We are also in accord with the general objects mentioned in your memorial, especially those in respect to residence headquarters, library, magazine, salaried officers, and distributing agencies.[25]

The changes referred to in the constitution were as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Constitution be changed so as to provide for a Chinese General Secretary and two Chinese members on the Executive Committee.[26]

There was still hope in 1909 that the budget approved by the Centenary Conference would find a response in Christian hearts in the West who would aid an interdenominational organization, but in the new constitution several years later, after the reorganization, there is no mention of a Chinese General Secretary. The Boards that sent out 2300 new missionaries between 1909 and 1919 refused to contribute, each, a few hundred dollars to the budget of the Association.

The new constitution, however, called for a General Advisory Committee, later termed the Advisory Council, to be composed of three delegates from each of the eight regions, "at least one of whom wherever possible shall be a Chinese." [27] The record of attendance at the Annual Meetings of the Advisory Committee during the period, as shown in Table 13, indicates that there was not much success in securing attendance of Chinese.

TABLE 13

Attendance at Annual Meeting, Advisory Council

Year	*Annual Meeting*	*Missionaries*	*Chinese*
1914	First	16	3
1915	Second	21	2
1917	Third	22	8
1918	Fourth	21	4
1919	Fifth	30	4

When we realize the nature of the regional associations, missionary organizations, meeting, some of them, at mountain or seaside resorts frequented by Westerners where the missionaries were on vacation, yet did not begrudge hard work on behalf of their Association, it is not surprising that

Chinese attendance at the Advisory Council was so small. When Chinese did attend, they were often not representative of missionary education in the regions which elected them. Dr. Fong and Dr. Kuo were regularly present. Dr. Chang Po-ling, founder of Nankai University, was present as delegate from Shantung in 1917.

In the ten years under review, there was very slight participation on the part of Chinese educationists in either the regional or national Educational Associations. They were, however, growing increasingly restive under missionary administration and were speaking out with considerable frankness on occasion.

Government Recognition

The Sixth Triennial and the Chinese Government, 1909. The Sixth Triennial (1909) displayed the tolerance born of success. Despite the refusal of the Chinese government to acknowledge their schools, these same schools were crowded with students, many of whom were the sons and daughters of officials. Mission colleges, both for the convenience of students who wished to go abroad and also because they had resigned all hope of securing a recognized status, had, Dr. Pott said, taken "the seemingly anomalous step" of becoming incorporated as American colleges on Chinese soil—"a curious extension of the principle of extra-territoriality." [28] Again he counseled mission institutions not to urge their claims for recognition, but to be grateful for their liberty under the treaties, their freedom to teach Christianity, and other advantages.[29] A second paper, by Dr. Anderson, president of Soochow University, dealt with the relation of the mission school to the government system, and viewed with much sympathy the point of view of the Chinese officials vis-a-vis the mission school. Chinese officials were plainly not opposed to Western learning.

> But the missionary, and especially the missionary engaged in educational work where large sums of money are expended for buildings and equipment is a standing problem to Chinese officialdom. . . . "I fear the Greeks even when they come bearing gifts," is a phrase that will express the official attitude.[30]

The President of the Association, George A. Stuart, of the Methodist Mission, Nanking, also spoke appreciatively of the achievements of the Chinese government in respect to education and warned the Association that their task of "awakening China" was finished, and that mission schools were not likely to play any further significant role in that capacity.[31] To those who still talked of mission schools as "models" for China, he spoke in plain language:

> It may be an ungracious thing to say, but it would seem that those who propose such things, either from lack of personal contact with the problem, or from an overweening sense of the superiority of the Westerner over the Chinese, fail to grasp real conditions in China. . . . China is quite willing and able to send her own commissioners abroad to study the problem from every side. And this she has done, is now doing, and will continue to do.[32]

In all three of these papers, there is appreciation of the achievements of the Chinese government in education, and of the official point of view with regard to mission schools, combined with an earnest determination to make the mission schools serve until, in the end, China would be compelled to recognize their contribution to the national well-being. Yet there is lack of insight into the new Chinese viewpoint growing up within the old framework of the Empire. This was supplied by Dr. Fong F. Sec who was invited to address the Sixth Triennial. Dr. Fong was head of the department of

English publications of the Commercial Press, a Chinese publishing concern described by Mr. Silsby in 1904 as a "great publishing house" which was, through its publications, "revolutionizing the schools of China." [33] Dr. Fong had lived in the United States and he was a Christian, facts which made it easy for him to appreciate the work of the missionaries, and also to point out weaknesses. Upon this occasion, he expressed his appreciation of their work and opened their eyes to their real position in China.

Dr. Fong F. Sec and Government Recognition. The topic assigned Dr. Fong, the first Chinese ever to address the EAC—a Japanese, the Rev. J. Harada, had been invited to address the Fifth Triennial, in 1905—was "The Co-operation of Chinese and Foreign Educationists in the Work of the Association." [34] Upon this topic, Dr. Fong said, he was unqualified to speak, as he knew little of the Association's work. He begged leave to speak on another topic, the co-operation of missionary educationists with the government, which was planning for the whole country. From his standpoint, government recognition, or the registration of schools, was a *sine qua non* for their remaining at work in China. And a *sine qua non* for registration was the loyal acceptance of the government course of study, the prescribed textbooks, and the scientific terminology approved by the Board of Education in Peking. He recognized that there was no Board of Education when the first mission colleges started their work, but now conditions were changed, and standardization was necessary.

> Mission schools, as a rule, are established for the benefit of Chinese young men, and the authorities connected with them, it is safe to say, naturally do not wish to see Chinese young men barred from the Chinese government service, after many years spent in such schools.[35]

He next took up the point of view prevailing among missionaries that it was impossible to secure recognition [36] and said, "There is no sound reason why this cannot be done." He then cited—not the instance of the application of the EAC through the American minister in 1906, but "a certain medical school" in Peking which made application through the German legation.

> It can be seen that the matter at once assumed the shape of a diplomatic question; hence the delay and the final decision of the Board. If other mission schools prefer to have their applications for registration made through their consuls and ministers, there is reason for apprehension. But is this measure absolutely necessary? It occurs to me that if the Association would get up a memorandum in the form of an application, and forward it direct to the Board of Education, requesting that mission schools be placed on the same footing as non-mission schools, there should be no difficulty whatever in the way of its realization.[37]

The tone of this suggestion is similar to that of the paragraph quoted from the Chinese paper by Mr. Lindenmeyer in the Canton region. The old attitude was that described by Dr. Anderson: "I fear the Greeks even when they come bearing gifts." The new attitude of the makers of the new China was that Westerners had no right to establish schools in China unless they were so authorized by the Chinese government, and that all such schools should be registered with the government, should be conducted according to government rulings, and should be regularly inspected.

The missionary response to this unexpected address does them credit. The recorded "Discussion" following the address showed them to be impressed and in hearty accord with the ideas presented. Here are typical excerpts:

> Rev. S. I. Woodbridge: "We should certainly adopt the technical terms which Dr. Fong says are being prepared by the Peking Board of Education."
>
> Dr. Timothy Richard: "A good suggestion of Mr. Fong is not to approach the government through foreign officials. Have more respect for our hosts, the Chinese."
>
> Dr. Hunter Corbett: "I wish heartily to endorse and emphasize the closing words of Dr. Fong's able paper. Co-operation and not opposition is the watchword."
>
> Dr. R. T. Bryan: "We must give our Chinese associates more power in management, and in this way we can secure co-operation between ourselves and our Christians; and this will be a steppingstone to co-operation with the government." [38]

The endorsement of Dr. Fong was not only in words. He was immediately elected to the Executive Committee of the EAC, and to another committee on Union Educational Establishments,[39] and began a relationship with the Association at this time that was practically lifelong.

Chinese Christian Educationists and Government Recognition. The "Appeal of Chinese Educationists" was motivated in the main by the recent disfranchisement of graduates of Christian schools. After courteously thanking the missionaries for having traveled so far and labored so indefatigably on behalf of the Christian religion, the authors of the appeal expressed gratitude for the Christian schools. But, they wrote, the attitude of the government to the Christian schools was working great hardship on Christian youth, some of whom were even turning their backs upon the Church and entering government institutions where they "bend the knee to Confucius." The only reason assigned in this document for the antagonism against the mission schools is that their courses of study are not acceptable, and that their products are "neither East nor West."

> It is stated that the reasons for falling off are: Because our courses of study are irregular and not so well adapted; . . . that there is undue preponderance of religion or science or vernacular or pedantry in our textbooks; that these textbooks in many instances are antiquated, ill adapted, and behind the times; that our schools do not use the same textbooks, and that our courses of study are not correlated; and, finally, that our finished products are neither East nor West. . . . Further, . . . our government has recently disfranchised the graduates of our church schools. . . . The outlook . . . is indeed gloomy. Defenceless and almost hopeless as we are, we appeal to your Association now opportunely holding its meetings in Shanghai. It is with the utmost respect, gentlemen, that we beg to offer a few suggestions that may in some small way relieve the situation.[40]

The first suggestion they offer indicates that they had been in touch with Dr. Fong.

> Let the Chinese and foreign missionaries present a petition to the Board of Education beseeching them to place our mission schools on the same footing with government schools.[41]

The missionaries replied to this as follows:

> The Educational Association has received these communications from our Chinese fellow workers and appreciates the courteous tone in which they were presented.
>
> As to the first item of the communication [*i.e.*, government recognition], the matter is fraught with such difficulties that we have referred it to the incoming Executive Committee, in consultation with Chinese educators, for their careful consideration.[42]

Little Progress in Securing Government Recognition, 1909-1919. The only progress made during the years 1909-1919 toward the achievement of recognition by the government was in the matter of adopting government textbooks and terminology. Progress along these lines was fairly steady, so that when the Educational Commission (1921-1922) recommended the adoption of the Chinese system of 1922, based upon the American educational system, the "6-6-4 plan," the change was virtually completed within two years.

While there was a sentiment abroad that mission schools should be registered, when the attempt was made, the government held coldly aloof. The West China Association had expected to achieve registration in the early days of the Republic, but in 1918 the report was that they were still ignored by the Chinese educational authorities.[43] Finally, a vague prospect for recognition of mission schools was held out in the regulations issued by the Ministry of Education in May, 1917, and this, coupled with the registration of primary-school teachers in Chekiang, Kiangsu, and other provinces, led in 1919, to the reappearance of this topic on the agenda of the East China Christian Educational Association.[44] Apparently, the young Republic was not willing to embark upon a struggle for educational autonomy until the time was ripe, and the issue was left in abeyance until the 1920's.

Missionary Views on Government Recognition. The missionaries recognized the truth in Dr. Fong's remarks on course of study, textbooks, and terminology, and began to act upon these suggestions. One point which Dr. Fong did not make was made by Dr. Bryan during the discussion following the address, namely that a steppingstone to co-operation with the government would be the securing of co-operation between themselves and the Chinese Christians by giving these latter more power in management. A. J. Bowen, also, some months later expressed his conviction that the desired recognition by the government would be achieved more rapidly if missionaries would surrender some of their "rights" and "privileges" and push the Chinese into places of trust and responsibility "just as rapidly as, and possibly a little more rapidly than, many think wise." [45]

In addition to adopting the government curriculum and putting Chinese into administrative positions, they also recognized that religious liberty would be an issue. This latter aspect was taken up at the Seventh Triennial—the last—and the two papers on this question were published in the *Chinese Recorder*.[46] But concern over religious liberty died away as it was perceived that the new and struggling Republic was not in a position to enforce any demands.

QUESTIONING OF THE MISSIONARY ROLE IN EDUCATION

Questioning of the Missionary Role in Education by Missionaries. Dr. Anderson was the first missionary to question the missionary role in Christian education in China. His paper read before the Sixth Triennial in May, 1909, showed insight into the government point of view, and sympathy with it, but in this respect he did not differ too markedly from Dr. Stuart or other colleagues. His article written a few months later, however, seems separated from the first by years instead of months. He wrote:

> We . . . are trying to do in China that which would seem ridiculous in America. The Americans do not hesitate to study the English, German, or French educational systems and to borrow freely from them whatever they consider better than their own. But they would scarcely think of importing a German and appointing him superintendent of education in any state, to make that wherein Germany might be superior to America at home in America. They instinctively feel that it is just this that he cannot do; the very fact that he is a foreigner unfits him for the task. And it is just this kind of work that in China must be done by a Chinese.[47]

Again, in contrast to the view put forward by Dr. Jackson in 1893, that the missionary should go to the classroom where he was superior to any native, Dr. Anderson set forward what was at that time an amazing thesis:

> But as to the business of working out an educational system suited to the character and needs of this people, the Chinese is the superior of the missionary simply because he is a Chinese.[48]

He pointed out that those who were trying to work out the course of study for the national system were confronted by the same problem that the EAC had never been able to solve, namely, the proper balance between the Chinese subjects and the new modern learning. The government system was overbalanced on the side of classical learning; the missionary system was overbalanced on the side of the new learning. Who, in the end, was better qualified to work out the proper balance than the graduates of mission institutions who were grounded both in Chinese and in modern subjects and who, in addition, held degrees from universities in the missionary's own country? If the missionary dared to say that these Chinese were denationalized, what of themselves? They had even less Chinese background. The changes in the constitution, looking to the inclusion of two Chinese on the Executive and a Chinese General Secretary, were, he said, all to the good, but the fact was that the EAC was so thoroughly foreign that Chinese could not function in it. He suggested a de-organization, and a beginning again with the Chinese. He did not mention the "Appeal of Chinese Educationists," but their request had been for just this: that they and the missionaries create an organization.

There is nothing in the entire article to suggest that he advocated the abdication of the missionaries. He deplored the racial arrogance which the missionary shared with others of his kind in assuming the responsibility of working out an educational system for a "backward people."

> It was simply a case of the "white man's burden." But, unfortunately, the white man sometimes insists upon groaning under this kind of burden when it could be borne more easily and more profitably both to himself and to the world by the non-white man.[49]

This point of view was so extraordinary that it was misinterpreted. An editorial declares that

> the time has not yet come when the foreigner can be dispensed with, if Chinese are to have the best education—and they ought to have the very best. . . . The Educational Association has not come to the end of its usefulness. It is not ready to surrender. We have just begun to realize the great possibilities for usefulness which lie before us. . . .[50]

There was no other missionary in this period who went to the roots of the problem in this fashion. Other discussions of the missionary role was along more conservative lines. Dr. George Stuart, in his presidential address at the Sixth Triennial, had called upon the EAC to rethink its role vis-a-vis the national system, but he nowhere suggested that Chinese Christians should be made responsible for the rethinking.[51] Indeed, the chief obstacle to creative thinking along this line was the obsession of the boards and those who stood closest to the boards with the problem of money. Occasionally, a missionary pointed out that it was un-Christian to say "He who pays the piper calls the tune," [52] but in the face of long-established practice such a protest did not reach far. Dr. Bowen, who maintained that Chinese had measured up to responsibilities in a remarkable way and that the best means to achieve the desired recognition by the government and rescue the graduates of mission schools from disfranchisement would be to push Chinese into places of authority, also states in the same article: (Author's italics)

> Some day we shall see the mission school, supported as it now is largely by foreign funds, controlled and managed by missionaries, foreign in its ideas and ideals and in every other way, gradually merge into the Christian school . . . *when its support and management shall be Chinese* . . . and when its Western teachers shall be called and not sent. Like the prophets of old, we shall die in this faith, not having seen the fulfilment of the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, confessing that we are but strangers and pilgrims in this land.[53]

While he would undoubtedly claim that the mission school was Christian, he differentiates between the mission school and the Chinese Christian school in this paragraph by defining the one as financed and controlled by foreigners and foreign "in its ideas and ideals and in every other way," the other as the Christian school into which the mission school will some day merge and have a support and management springing from China.

Questioning of the Missionary Role in Education by Chinese

Dr. Anderson set forward the Chinese point of view in these words:

> But while the missionary has labored, time has slipped by. . . . A native element has already been created, who are today fully competent at least to share with the foreigner the direction and control of this work, both in church and school. . . . These men can but realize their fitness for this work as compared with many of the missionaries. Many of

> them were educated and hold degrees from the same schools in which the missionaries were trained, and besides they are here in their own land, among their own people. . . . [The Chinese] does not assert himself when ignored and passed over, and a foreigner of smaller calibre and of far less accurate knowledge of conditions is entrusted with responsible office and set up over him. But [he] can think and feel, and the result of all this is that . . . many of the ablest . . . Chinese are not looking for a share in the direction and control of . . . the present Educational Association, but rather to new organizations that are of the Chinese, for the Chinese, and in which Chinese can work out their own system, best suited to their profit and welfare as they have ever done.[54]

This article is the first and last written by Dr. Anderson on this subject. His sudden death, caused by pneumonia, occurred some months later.[55]

The Chinese evidently became increasingly vocal on the subject of the management of Christian schools after the Revolution of 1911. The editor of the *Chinese Recorder* comments on it.

> To say the least, this is a complicated problem: there are the home boards, the missions, the Chinese Christians, the Chinese people, and the various denominations, all of whom desire to have some hand in the control of the schools of China. On the one hand, the foreign organizations, by reason of the support given feel that they have the right to control these institutions. On the other hand, there are the Chinese who feel that since these schools are for the good of their own people they should have a large voice in their management.[56]

The first Chinese writer on the subject of the control of the Christian school in the *Educational Review* was S. K. Tsao, whose paper, read at the Third Annual Meeting of the East China Christian Educational Association, maintained that the missionary role was "behind the curtain," while a Chinese Board of Control settled school policy. He advocated this as a measure to make the funds invested in missions yield the greatest results.

> We sometimes, if not often, hear the missionaries say, when a Chinese wants a free hand, "I am the boss. The institution is supported by funds from my country and therefore you keep off the grass." This is true. We all admit it in principle, but you want to use the money which your boards supply so as to yield the most good, otherwise you are not true to your trust.[57]

The following year, another Chinese speaker addressed the Fourth Annual Meeting of the same body and criticized the mission middle school in general for its poor Chinese department, its lack of social etiquette, its poor quality of Chinese teachers, due to inadequate salary, its overemphasis upon Bible study—in some schools, he said, about one fourth the time was centered upon Bible study—and its poor arrangement of buildings. He closed his arraignment with a paragraph on the "school-principal problem."

> A final problem . . . is the school-principal problem. Many Chinese think it would be better for mission middle schools to have a Chinese principal to take charge of the school affairs. He knows better the Chinese customs and manners and knows better how to control Chinese students, deal with Chinese teachers, and associate with the parents of students. . . . Some missions have already tried this plan and are quite well satisfied with their work.[58]

For years, the missionary educator had claimed that the Chinese teacher was a poor disciplinarian. Here, the Chinese is claiming that present-day students need handling by a Chinese. What he thinks the foreigner should do in the middle school is bluntly stated.

> Foreigners may act as assistant teachers and treasurers if necessary.[59]

Still a year later, another Chinese teacher, addressing the Shantung Christian Educational Association, also mentions the fact that most principals of middle schools are foreigners, which indicates that some are Chinese. He deplores the fact that relationships between the foreign principal and Chinese teachers is not that of colleagues working for a common end, but more that of employer and employees.[60]

This was the state of affairs—widespread dissatisfaction with missionary administration of schools—when the Patriotic Movement of 1919 flared.

The Patriotic Movement, Spring, 1919

The spring of 1919 brought crisis to China and precipitated crises in many schools, government and mission, throughout the country. The Versailles Conference had failed to return Shantung to China. When it became known that dishonest officials in Peking were signing away certain rights to the Japanese, indignation rose to a high pitch in China. On May 4, 1915, students in large centers all over the country held parades and demonstrations. Students' unions were organized throughout the country, and the bankers and merchants came to their support. For a month secret preparations were made for a great national strike, which came June 4-6, and must have been lived through to be appreciated. The whole country literally went on strike. Stores were closed as at China New Year; banks and post offices ceased to function. No steamers moved on the Yangtze. Even the sing-song girls struck. Ominous tension prevailed, succeeded by a mood of delirious joy when the Japanophile officials resigned and fled to Japan.

Just as the Patriotic Movement was at its height, Dr. John Dewey arrived in China. He wrote home of those stirring days:

> In a country regarded at home as stagnant and unchanging, there is certainly something doing. This is the world's greatest kaleidoscope.[61]

The foreign principals in mission middle schools were in an unenviable position during the months of May and June, the last two months of the school year. So were Chinese principals, but the Westerner was in a peculiarly trying position. Students were constantly at meetings, or in parades. The examinations which were due the middle of June and which would determine the scholarship awards, or college entrance, or even ordinary promotion, made the principals loath to have their students in secret meetings at night and in demonstrations in the day. P. C. Hsü wrote of it a year later, saying:

> When the Patriotic Movement was on, very few mission-school principals could handle this situation in a satisfactory way.[62]

From this time on, the rising feeling against foreign administration of mission schools, which had been growing among teachers, students, and parents of students—those who were within the system—was reinforced by the rising tide of nationalism without.

CHAPTER VII

Christianity in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927

The Merging of the Renaissance and Patriotic Movements

THE shouting and tumult of the turbulent twenties revealed a new China to those who had previously thought of the Chinese as phlegmatic and without patriotism. Following the demonstrations of May and June, 1919, China had two movements instead of one. The Patriotic and New Civilization Movements merged, however, each strengthening the other, until it was difficult to tell where the one left off and the other began, as is revealed in such periodicals as *New Society*, *Awakening the World*, and others of like nature. Following *La Jeunesse*, many new periodicals had appeared, and in the spring of 1919 there were a hundred forty. This number was almost doubled within a year of May, 1919, which had seen the birth of the Patriotic Movement.[1] P. C. Hsü expressed the Chinese satisfaction.

> Since "May the 4th" last year, everybody in China has seen, with mixed amazement and joy, two new movements,

> namely, the Patriotic Movement and the Renaissance Movement. At first people suspected that the so-called Patriotic Movement was instigated by a certain political party, but time has sufficiently proved that it goes much deeper than that.[2]

Always there had been tremendous pride of civilization, of culture, in the "Sons of Han," as the Chinese are fond of calling themselves, looking back to the first great dynasty of a united people; but the 1920's saw the development of the modern spirit of nationalism. The new term which came into common speech was *ai kuo* (patriotism, or, literally, "love country"), and it came into the general consciousness by way of the school. Chinese public opinion was deeply stirred over the shooting into an unarmed crowd by police of the International Settlement, Shanghai, on May 30, 1925, when nine students were killed—stirred to the point where "even diplomats" had to "offer sovereign rights in her own country to China." [3] Commenting on the significance of the phenomenal happenings after the May 30 incident, F. W. S. O'Neill says:

> The immediate cause of the whirlwind was the killing of students. . . . When, for instance, the four youths who were shot dead on the 30th of May, and the five others who died later of their wounds, are referred to as "mere schoolboys," the significance of the tragedy is quite obscured.
>
> Up until the beginning of the twentieth century, patriotism in the modern sense was either unknown or almost silent. At the date of my arrival in the country, 1897, the words *ai kuo* were unfamiliar. How striking a revolution in sentiment a quarter of a century has made! This revolution was brought about, not by the governing classes . . . not by the merchants . . . very much less by the vast speechless multitude of tillers of the soil; it rose in the modern colleges and schools. Born in the blind fury of the Boxer Rising,

> the spirit of nationality passed a sickly childhood . . . until the Republic quickened its vitality. The . . . Japanese Twenty-one Demands, followed . . . by the unique political demonstration . . . [of 1919] showed the youth his strength. Then came the final stage, when the spirit of nationality astonished the world by springing into full-grown manhood in the summer of 1925.[4]

This description of the role of the student shows genuine insight on the part of the writer. Nevertheless, it is also true that students were exploited for political ends in these years. Under the special conditions prevailing in China during the early years of the Republic it is difficult to see how this exploitation could have been avoided. The National Students' Union stretched across all barriers of political faction and extended into every province.

THE ANTI-RELIGION MOVEMENT

A third movement began in 1922—the Anti-Religion Movement. This movement was launched as an anti-Christian movement by a Communist student group in Shanghai and was one of the first evidences of the newly organized Communist Party.[5] The spark which set this movement off was the special number of *Association Progress* in which the World's Student Christian Federation was discussed.

> A tiny group of Bolshevik students in Shanghai read this special number, dismissed the only Christian member of their group and wrote the proclamation of the Non-Christian Student Federation, an inflammatory article which was widely circulated. The fire quickly gained headway. They published a booklet entitled *Why We Oppose the World's Student Christian Federation.* Their attack was solely against Christianity.[6]

The account continues with the early activities of the Federation: the circular telegrams, the immense enthusiasm for the movement among students and workmen in Kwangtung, and so on, and then tells of the opposition of certain professors in the National University at Peking who, while not themselves Christians, or, indeed, believers in any religion, yet opposed the Anti-Christian Movement on the ground that the constitution of the Chinese Republic gave Chinese citizens the right to believe in religion. This brought the declaration of the Federation that it was not Bolshevik: it had been started by a small Communist group, who had directed it entirely against Christianity, but when the Movement reached Peking, the anti-Christian bias was felt to be too narrow, and the name was changed to the Anti-Religion Movement.[7] In this form, it was really a phase of the Renaissance, and the anti-Christian aspect was temporarily shelved. The writer warned, however, that the flames were merely smoldering, and were ready to be fanned into flame at the opportune moment.[8]

The questioning of the tenets of Christianity had begun before the spring of 1922. At a time when every human value was being re-examined in China, religion could not escape. For a thousand years, religion had been under eclipse: the Sung philosophers had squeezed Buddhism dry, re-thinking primitive Confucianism in the universal terms of Buddhism, since which time Neo-Confucianism had been dominant. Buddhism had been successfully secularized.[9] Among the masses, of course, superstition was the rule. When the Renaissance came, determined to re-value China's heritage in the light of science, and to make a clean sweep of all superstitions, the missionaries, who had been fighting superstition, suddenly found themselves accused of introducing new superstitions: belief in miracles, in a world created in seven days, in the Trinity.[10] In such fashion, were profound theological insights jumbled with accounts dating from a prescientific era. According to many, any values inherent in religion would survive into the scientific era in science, philosophy, and aesthetics. Yet, in scientific fashion, these modern Chinese rationalists [11] gave Christians an opportunity to defend Christianity and to explain how they thought it could survive in the new world that was being created by science. It also undertook to point out the failures of organized religion and asked why, in the light of twenty centuries of failure, the Church thought it should have another chance? And finally, they undertook to point out the ethical values in the Bible, and especially in the teachings of Jesus.[12] Ch'en Tu-hsiu, one of the leading figures of the Renaissance, wrote:

> My idea is that Christianity is the religion of love, and unless we accept the doctrine of Nietzsche, condemning the love of fellow men, then we cannot lightly say that we have done with the Christian religion. . . .
>
> The doctrine of Creation, Trinity, and miracles, are mostly traditions of the past, which have been nullified by the historical and physical sciences. We should discard them and search for new ones. What are the new beliefs? They are embodied in Jesus' wonderful personality. . . . Aside from the character and teaching of Jesus, we know no other Christian doctrine. Such fundamental teaching has not been destroyed by science, and never will be.[13]

RESPONSE OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY TO THE NEW MOVEMENTS

The Christian community responded to all the movements of the times. Christian students, no less than non-Christian, had participated in the demonstrations of the spring of 1919. The Japanese press—quite in contrast to the Young China Party who questioned the patriotism of students in Christian schools [14]—accused the Chinese Christians and the Christian Church of participation in the attack upon the pro-Japanese officials in May, 1919. Dr. C. Y. Cheng, leader of the Chinese Christian forces, undertook to reply to the Japanese press and to address his fellow Christians on the special function of the Christian Church to serve as guide to the public conscience. He said:

> For the first time in Chinese history the educated and patriotic young sons and daughters of China have publicly manifested their love for their country in a remarkable and, in general, orderly way. What they have done, and the way they have done it commanded not only the respect of all lovers of China, but have won a real victory. . . .
>
> As the Christian church stands for truth and righteousness and helps in the development of true democratic ideals, it naturally welcomes such a spirit as that which has prompted the (Patriotic) Movement. . . . We do not believe that the church should mix itself up with party politics . . . but when it comes to questions of national righteousness and justice, the Christian church has a duty to perform. . . . We are happy to say that many Christian students have taken part in the Movement and some have even suffered for doing so. We are proud of our students for their courage, heroism, and sacrificial spirit.[15]

Significantly, the China-for-Christ Movement, under Chinese leadership, was organized in December, 1919, and the National Christian Council, with Dr. Cheng as general secretary, was organized in 1922. As "patriotism" became a new word in common parlance in these years, so, in Christian circles, the word "indigenous" was on every tongue. The word appeared first in an article by C. T. Wang in 1921: "Making Christianity Indigenous in China." Christianity, he said, must become a native plant, growing in Chinese soil.

> We all realize that plants change their nature by being transplanted. Our silkworm was imported to Italy, and the

> silk produced is different. Then they took over the mulberry tree and in a few generations it changed its character. We have imported cotton seed from America . . . and . . . it has changed. In the same way . . . Christianity should also change its character.[16]

The chief point stressed by this article, and by other Chinese writers, was that Christianity could never become indigenous under missionary leadership. It could only be naturalized under Chinese leadership. In the nineteenth century, missionaries had, in the main, thought of training Chinese only up to the point of making "assistants," or "helpers." That, he said, was a wrong policy.

> You must train them so that when young missionaries are sent to China they may be put under Chinese who . . . are qualified for such leadership. . . . So long as mission work remains under the direction of missionaries, so long is it a strange institution in the land.[17]

Dr. Cheng, also, indicated what the proper relationship between Chinese and Western Christians should be in the title of his opening address to the National Christian Conference in May, 1922: "Chinese Christian Independence and Western Christian Co-operation." [18] This movement toward independence on the part of the Chinese Christians was accompanied by the assumption of responsibility for the defense of Christian tenets against the criticisms of Renaissance thinkers. The Peking Apologetic Group was organized to study the future of Christianity in China—to seek its adaptation to twentieth-century Chinese thought and twentieth-century Chinese social needs. The journal *Life* was to be their organ.[19] Their statement read in part:

> The world is making rapid progress . . . and since Christianity is a world-saving religion, it must of necessity adapt

> itself to the present new situation. . . . Consequently we . . . [must] interpret in modern terms the truths of our religion.
>
> Every country has its particular customs and habits and the thought, language, and literature of its people have close relation to these customs and habits. The customs and habits of China are neither those of Judea two thousand years ago, nor of America and Europe of today. . . . Consequently, the people of China must have a special explanation of the Christian religion.
>
> As the principles of Christianity are all-inclusive and eternal, the sciences that came into being since the coming of Christ should not be in conflict with the articles of faith.[20]

This statement, like the article by Ch'en Tu-hsiu (also written Chen Tu-seu), appeared in 1920, two years before the rise of the Anti-Religion Movement in 1922. In Chinese-Christian intellectual circles, the anti-Religion Movement was regarded with some satisfaction. T. Z. Koo, writing several years later, said:

> The Anti-Religion Movement started in 1922 is the first definite evidence that educated Chinese have consciously accepted the fact that religion is a force to be reckoned with in China. As far as the Christian church is concerned, the Anti-Religion Movement is the first recognition she has received from the educated classes of China that the Christian religion is a force which can no longer be treated with indifference.[21]

It meant, this Anti-Religion Movement which had resulted from the Communist Anti-Christian attack, that Christianity was discussed, *pro* and *con*, in the secular press.[22] In so far as it was attacked on the grounds of its incompatibility with science, or its inadaptability to Chinese culture, Chinese

Christians and liberal non-Christians welcomed the discussion. A writer in an independent, nonpartisan Chinese monthly, *The Critical Review*, said:

> During the last few months there has appeared the so-called Anti-Religion Movement. . . . It came like a mighty wind and wherever its influence reached, students have rushed into it. If its motive is pure and born of enthusiasm for the study of science . . . we ought to help it on. . . .
>
> . . . My opinion is that if Christianity is . . . to be naturalized in China, its forms, organizations, and theologies must undergo a thorough modification and correction. To impose upon the top of the civilization of China those Hellenized and Romanized institutions and theologies is to force upon us a form of absolute autocracy. . . .[23]

There were misgivings, however, that this "mighty wind" came from Moscow. The same writer continued:

> Some suspected that certain Russians came to China with large amounts of money to spread Bolshevism and that this had some intimate relationship with the present Anti-Religion Movement.[24]

Response of the Missionaries to the New Movements

These years saw the peak of the missionary strength in China. The number of Protestant missionaries reported in 1919 was 6636, and in 1926, 8325. (See Appendix A.) They, too, showed the influence of the times. The word "indigenous", for example, was taken up with enthusiasm.[25] Within three months after the appearance of Dr. Wang's article, the word appears in a title and, three years later (1924) in the titles of six articles, and many more times in that same year as the theme of articles dealing with church architecture, or medical missions, or some other phase of missionary work, as well as in editorials. Education had been regarded as the Westerner's specialty, but by 1924, the steady talk of "indigenization" and Chinese leadership had produced such changes in the college group that Chinese leadership in education emerged in that year.[26]

The editorial board of the *Chinese Recorder* made a very special effort during these years to bring Chinese thought before the missionary body, both the best Chinese-Christian thought and the non-Christian thinking on religion in general and Christianity in particular. T. C. Chao and others made translations from the secular press, *e.g.*, "What the Chinese are Thinking about Christianity," which ran through a number of months in 1921-1922. The voluminous writings by Chinese Christian leaders are evidence of the seriousness with which they attempted to interpret the implications of the Chinese Renaissance for the planting of Christianity in China. No less than one hundred thirty-eight articles and translations by Chinese are to be found in the *Chinese Recorders*, 1919-1926. Of this number, approximately one fifth were done by T. C. Chao, T. T. Lew, and T. Z. Koo.

The response of the missionaries to the challenge of Chinese intellectual attacks upon Christianity varied with their theology. For those who were of the Fundamentalist school, the outlook was gloomy. A young YWCA secretary wrote of the consternation in Christian ranks as follows:

> I have rejoiced in the great splendid group of Chinese Christians and in the devoted service of the missionaries, but . . . the strong, idealistic currents in modern China such as those of the Renaissance, are outside the Christian community. . . .
>
> To sum it all up, the words I have heard most frequently among missionaries are the words "protect" and "careful." We must protect our movement from the Chinese Renaissance and be careful over the differences of theological

> opinion among the missionaries. But this use of "protect" and "careful" is not the speech of freedom, it is the speech of fear. . . . Christian truth needs to be explained so that it can be understood, but it does not need to be protected. It can stand exposure to all the winds that sweep the world.[27]

This evaluation was probably true of a majority of the eight-thousand missionaries, but there were mission groups, as groups, as well as individuals in more conservative groups, who rejoiced with Chinese Christian scholars that Christianity was being challenged and who appreciated the new tool, the *pai hua,* with which to work. T. T. Lew's prophecy of what this meant to Christianity was fulfilled within fifteen years. He wrote:

> The day is coming when one can express his thoughts without seeking the aid of ancient authorities for every little thing which he wishes to say; . . . when one can express aesthetic feeling and emotions in his own way without using ancient poetic phrases or historic allusions. All this is very significant for Christian work. We may now look for the production of genuine Christian hymns almost impossible under the old conditions. . . . We can also confidently hope that public prayers . . . will . . . contain more value for worship. We can confidently hope for a new Christian literature. . . . This is therefore a triumphant day.[28]

THE KUOMINTANG-COMMUNIST RAPPROCHEMENT AND BREAK

The last years of this period, 1924-1927, were stormy ones. The Kuomintang in Canton, failing to secure the aid of the Democracies, accepted the proffered aid of Russia, and in August, 1923, Comrade Michael Borodin arrived to act as adviser to Sun Yat-sen. In January, 1924, Communists were officially permitted to join the party—"on the understanding that they accepted Kuomintang principles and that the Kuomintang did not accept Communist principles."[29] The Russians rendered valuable service to China in the fight against Western aggression in these years. Finally, in June, 1926, more than a year after Dr. Sun's death in Peking, March, 1925, the Kuomintang was organized along soviet lines under the chairmanship of Wang Ching-wei, Comrade Borodin, adviser. Chiang Kai-shek was made commander-in-chief of the Northern Expeditionary Force which left Canton in July, and marched up, one section through Fukien and one through Kiangsi and Hunan. Wuchang, opposite Hankow, on the Yangtse, fell on October 8, 1926, after a siege of around forty days, and the offices of government moved from Canton to Wuchang some weeks later, when Central China experienced what the Communist-dominated Kuomintang revolution meant. Meantime, the struggle between the original Kuomintang party and the Russians was coming to a head. Many Chinese were incensed that the Communists were taking over the party, and there was undoubted resentment at Russian domination.[30] In November, 1926, Chiang demanded that the March meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang should be held at Nanchang, without the presence of the Russians. These latter, however, succeeded in having the meeting held in Hankow, and the result of the meeting was that Chiang was dropped from membership in the Committee (of which Wang Ching-wei was chairman). There was also a threat to withdraw his military powers.

> Chiang defied the Hankow group and took measures for the maintenance of his position. It was his forces who gained control of the Shanghai area on March 21. Simultaneously there was a race between his men and those of General Cheng Chien, representative of Hankow, for the capture of

> Nanking. Cheng's men won, and the incident earlier described occurred. [Note: the attack on foreign nationals in Nanking.] The expectations of the Hankow radicals and communists, that the attack on foreign nationals would result in a general bombardment of Nanking by the powers, which would so anger the Chinese people that the radicals could seize permanent control, were not realized. Chinese public opinion was shocked at the excesses of the radicals, and Chiang Kai-shek, far from ruined by the Nanking affair, found himself strengthened and able, on April 18, to establish a government in Nanking.[31]

The division between Chiang and Borodin was reflected in the provincial and local bureaus of education throughout China.

CHAPTER VIII

Missionary Education in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927

MISSIONARY EDUCATION VIS-A-VIS GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

IN 1915, Dr. Fong had said that there were no better schools in the land than mission schools; in 1920, Dr. Pott admitted that government schools were in the lead.

> We have lagged behind in making our education practical and vocational. We find ourselves in the position of taking a lead from the Chinese educational system rather than giving a lead. We . . . find ourselves faced with many difficulties, partly due to lack of finances, and partly due to our own conservatism. . . . It is well for us to be perfectly frank about the matter, and to confess that much remains to be done if we are to make our share in the education of China one that will prove most fruitful and beneficial.[1]

The cause of education had flourished under the stimulus of the New Civilization Movement. Drs. Dewey and Monroe had visited China in the happy position of honored teachers of many Chinese educators. The changing position of mission education in China in relation to the government system was indicated by Dr. Monroe in 1921 when he pointed out the necessity for mission education to rethink its goal. The education of the masses was too stupendous a problem to be undertaken by any other than the whole people through their government. Nor could the dozen struggling mission colleges or universities compete with the national universities.

> One native institution, the national university, has now nearly 2500 students . . . pursuing western science. It has a budget of nearly a million dollars and has on its staff of three hundred some distinguished world scholars. . . . Probably all the mission institutions of higher grade combined cannot equal this one in budget, student body, staff, or number of returned students employed. The government plans four such institutions; the missions have two or three times this number aspiring to be colleges or universities. Mission education must seek some other aim than this.[2]

In his opinion, the missions should concentrate their educational efforts upon a very few institutions of higher education in which they attempted "professional work in any one line in only one institution." [3]

The exotic character of mission institutions also became a handicap instead of an asset in these years. The necessity for adjustment to the government system was dwelt upon by Dr. Monroe, by the Educational Commission, and other writers of this period. Mission schools and colleges had begun in the nineteenth century, and tended to remain in that mold, whereas the government institutions were created by the twentieth-century returned student group from the West who emphasized science and the vocational aspects.

A third revision of the Chinese educational system—the "system of 1922" [4]—was undertaken, when Chinese education was modeled upon the American 6-6-4 plan. Chu You-kwang says of this revision:

> As an indirect result of the New Thought Movement in China, of the apparent triumph of democracy in the World War, and of increasing educational and cultural contacts with the United States, Chinese educators began to get away from the earlier influence of Japan, and indirectly of continental Europe, and to lean towards American ideals of education. There was growing dissatisfaction with the school system of 1912 until it finally culminated in the adoption of the American 6-3-3 plan.[5]

Despite the warnings of Dr. Monroe and all friends of mission education that the expansion period should end while increased attention should be paid to improving the standards of existing schools, the number of mission schools continued to increase until 1924—generally recognized as the "peak year" in mission education—from some 265 middle schools in 1919 to 339 in 1924, which made them about a fourth of the total number of middle schools in China.[6] The increase in the number of middle-school students was even greater: from some ten to twenty-five thousand.[7] These figures indicate how much the demand for educational facilities in China exceeded the supply. The rising nationalism would have had the tendency to drive students to government schools, had not these schools been full to overflowing.

Growing Antagonism toward Christian Schools

Three forces—rationalism, nationalism, and communism—were arrayed against the mission schools, 1919-1924, combining in 1924 their attacks against the mission schools as fostering superstition, as denationalizing agencies, and as agencies for the spread of capitalism.

Rationalism. In 1922, Dr. Hu Shih and two others brought a proposal before the First Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education to the effect that no religious education be allowed in the kindergarten or elementary grades. The purpose of this was that immature minds might not be biased.[8] In 1924, the National Conference of Provincial Educational Associations passed a resolution, jointly proposed by three provincial associations (Kiangsi, Honan, and Hupeh) forbidding religious teaching in any grade of school.[9] Several years later, in the midst of the attacks, Dr. Hu Shih explained his position as follows:

> We do not believe in your holding textbooks and chalk in one hand and the Gospel of Matthew in the other. Education is for the good of children, not for the glory of God. Schools are places for the development of human ability, not for the training of disciples of any particular sect. To utilize schools and to take advantage of the simple minds of children for religious propaganda is dishonest and immoral. . . . Give men a chance to think. If from their own experience they are convinced that religion is necessary they will accept Christianity from conviction and will be earnest and sincere Christians. One such Christian is worth a hundred or a thousand others. St. Augustine is an example.[10]

The answer of the missionaries to this was that such a course prejudiced the child against religion.

Nationalism. This rationalistic point of view was further strengthened by nationalism. According to the constitution of the Republic, individual religious liberty had been guaranteed. Mission schools, protected by their extraterritorial status, were able to disregard the law of the land and proceed, as in their own lands, on the assumption of institutional religious liberty. However, at one point, the idea of institutional religious liberty seems to have been accepted by the Chinese government. When the conservatives wished to make "worship of Confucius" obligatory after the Revolution of 1911, the reply came that this could be done only in self-financed, private schools.[11] The Minister of Education, the Honorable Fan Yuan-lien, showed his undisguised resentment against mission schools on this score in an address delivered before the Chihli-Shansi Christian Educational Association in February, 1921. Lumping Roman Catholics and Protestants together, he said that, although Christians had been working in China for hundreds of years, they did not understand Chinese psychology. Compulsory chapel antagonized students, he said, because it was not included in ordinary school regulations, and the same held true of Bible study.

> They [chapel and Bible study] are only for the use of students who believe in Christianity. If you compel a student to attend these classes which are not important, it . . . arouses his antipathy. Moreover, it is against the constitution of the Chinese government which allows freedom of worship. Furthermore, it is against the fundamental principle of education. . . . I think you Christians ought to make some change.[12]

Another point in which mission schools had injured Chinese national pride for many years was their neglect of Chinese. Dr. Anderson had pointed this out in the title of his article, "Has the Educational Association of China Fulfilled Its Mission?" He claimed that this Association, brought into existence to work out a satisfactory course of study had never been able to achieve anything of "real value" and never would as long as the only persons competent to work out the problem were absent.

> Yet the old cannot be neglected. It is China's own. It represents her development through several thousand years and it holds very much that is not only valuable to China today, but much that will be valuable to the world. . . . That in some schools the new learning is being taught

> through the Chinese language only, rather than through the English, does not affect this question. To gain a knowledge of the history and science of the West through the Chinese language is a very different thing from gaining a correct or adequate knowledge of the Chinese language, history, and literature.[13]

Even before commenting on compulsory attendance upon chapel and Bible classes, Minister Fan had mentioned as "the worst deficiency" the neglect of Chinese.

> Once I read an examination paper written by a student from a Christian school. The writer knew everything about foreign affairs, but did not know the name of a very popular man in Chinese history which should have been familiar even to a schoolboy of twelve . . . and the questions regarding Chinese geography and history in that paper were not answered. . . . Generally speaking all students educated in Christian schools are lacking in knowledge of their own country. . . . If those whom you have educated do not even know the most important things about their own country, then the school you have established is evidently not suited to the present social conditions.[14]

Before closing his address, Minister Fan warned that a notable change was taking place in the Chinese public toward Christian education, "from toleration to antipathy,"[15] in which the Ministry of Education could not interfere. He hoped to see such changes in mission policy as would eliminate friction.

It is possible that he had in mind the Young China Society, and other patriotic groups. P. C. Hsü said that leaders of the "popular movement" were not willing to see Chinese youth educated in Christian schools, even granting the good intention of the Christian schools. These held that it was up to China to educate her own youth.[16]

Communism. Latest to arrive, but with the zeal of the proverbial new broom, was Communism. Its first attempt to fight the mission schools in the spring of 1922 had seemed a failure, but, after the attack on Christian schools by the National Federation of Provincial Educational Associations at Kaifeng in August, 1924, Sanford C. C. Chen, Associate General Secretary of the China Christian Educational Association (CCEA) wrote:

> To some of our readers it may seem that the National Association for the Advancement of Education and the Federation of Provincial Educational Associations were responsible for the origin of the movement [against Christian schools]; but further study convinces us that the forces behind the scenes have been working ever since the World Student Christian Federation held its conference in Peking, in April, 1922. Although the agitation of that year died out after a short outburst, yet the anti-Christian feeling was never extinguished. . . . The open attack began again in the Nanking Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Education last July.[17]

Mr. Chen then went on to explain that what had occurred at Nanking in July and at Kaifeng in October, 1924, was an instance of successful propaganda promoted by two groups: the Young China Society author of a movement for nationalism in education; [18] and "another strong, well-organized, and radical party," [19] financed from Moscow, which had joined forces with them. In addition to the arguments of rationalists and nationalists against Christianity, there was now added the Moscow bias against "capitalist" Christianity.

These three elements were setting the stage for events in 1924 and thereafter. Meanwhile, of course, they were powerfully affecting the thinking of Christian Chinese and of many missionaries, either producing changes or preparing the way for changes.

ATTEMPTS TO MAKE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION INDIGENOUS

Handicaps of Missionary Education. As early as 1920, P. C. Hsü pointed out that the mission educational policy was being worked out under a serious handicap. There was the mounting feeling abroad, and they were "foreign" schools, unregistered, nearly always under foreign principals.

> Invariably the principal of the mission school is a missionary. If he is an educator himself, and if he has a very good Chinese associate, everything is all right. But in many cases it is not so. . . . As a rule mission-school students speak good English and are well-trained in athletics, but their Chinese is poor. Somehow or other, the mission education policy and the national educational policy do not go together very well. When the Patriotic Movement was on, very few mission-school principals could handle this situation in a satisfactory way.[20]

If this was the case with the local school, the situation was infinitely worse with the regional Christian educational associations and with the Advisory Council headquarters. The organization was as completely missionary as it had been when Dr. Anderson had labeled it "The Educational Association of the Foreign Missionaries representing the Protestant Churches in China." Its officers were entirely missionary; its sole secretary was Dr. Frank D. Gamewell, who edited the sole journal, the *Educational Review;* such Chinese as were on committees were government or independent Chinese educators (Dr. Fong Sec, Dr. P. W. Kuo, Dr. T. H. Lee), or such a person as Dr. David Z. T. Yui, General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. Few of the regional associations used the Chinese language in conducting annual meetings, or even went so far as to have a Chinese vice-president. (The East China Association alternated between Dr. Fong and Dr. Kuo for the office of vice-president.) This was the situation in

1919, but there were stirrings. The school, like the church, must be "indigenized."

Visit of the China Educational Commission. In his first report to the Advisory Council at the First Annual Meeting in 1914, Dr. Gamewell called attention to requests from several parts of the field for an educational survey.[21] The following year, the Advisory Council made a definite recommendation. Owing to World War I, however, the matter was indefinitely postponed, and was not taken up again until 1918.[22] Finally, in September, 1921, the Commission, led by E. D. Burton, of the University of Chicago, began its work. Among the American members were William F. Russell, then of the State University of Iowa, and Kenyon L. Butterfield, president of the Massachusetts Agricultural College. Percy M. Roxby, University of Liverpool, was the one member from the United Kingdom. The nine from abroad were joined by J. Leighton Stuart, E. W. Wallace, H. B. Graybill, Frank D. Gamewell, Edwin C. Lobenstine, Clara J. Lambert, and Mrs. Lawrence Thurston, missionaries, and by Chang Po-ling, P. W. Kuo, and Yau Tsit Law (Miss Y. T. Law), Chinese educators.[23] This Commission came out to "look back over the past, survey the present, and deliberately plan for the future." [24] They were commissioned by those who sent them (four bodies representing virtually all the Protestant interests in China) as follows:

> Looking toward the future of China and in particular to the development of the Christian community, the Commission will inquire on the one hand what part education shall take in building up the Christian church, and on the other hand among the total educational forces of China what part Christian education shall take.[25]

The conclusions reached by this group were summarized in a phrase which became a slogan: Christian education must become "more efficient, more Christian, more Chinese."[26] Among the suggestions for making Christian education "more Chinese," we find: the adoption of the government "system of 1922;" the acceptance of the government curriculum; the reorganization of the regional associations, which were voluntary missionary organizations, into Provincial Boards of Christian Education with representation from the churches; the reorganization of the CCEA into a National Board of Christian Education, with four National Councils: the Council on Higher Education, the Council on Secondary and Elementary Education, the Council on Extension and Adult Education, and the Council on Religious Education. All these suggestions were carried out in the next several years. They worked a revolution in bringing the term "Christian education" into general use in place of "mission education." Mission education was an exotic; Christian education was permanent. Above all, the Commission recommended the development of a Chinese leadership in education as speedily as possible.

The Report of the Commission was received with enthusiasm, and within two years of its publication (1922) one hurdle between the Christian schools and government recognition was taken. This was the acceptance (a) of the 6-6-4 classification and (b) of the curriculum.[27]

Regional Associations and Indigenization. The Chihli-Shansi Christian Educational Association, like the Fukien and Central China associations, held its annual meetings during summer vacation at a summer resort. Also, as with these two, there was an occasional English-speaking Chinese present as guest, or, perhaps, even speaker on the program. In the summer of 1919, the annual meeting was held at Paitaiho without the presence of a single Chinese. The newly elected president of what has since become Yenching University, Dr. J. Leighton Stuart, however, was present for the first time. There seems little reason to doubt that he was responsible for the decision taken on that occasion to hold future meetings of the Association at a time and place convenient for the Chinese and in the Chinese language. The first such annual meeting was held in Peking, February, 1921, with some fifty Chinese and thirty Westerners present.[28] This was the meeting addressed by the Minister of Education, Mr. Fan. (See above.)

Simultaneously, significant changes were taking place in the Kwangtung Christian Educational Association: a Chinese vice-president was elected for the first time in 1920, and a Chinese president, in 1921.[29] It was also reported that Chinese was increasingly used in conducting the business of the Association.[30] And very significant was Mr. Graybill's paper on "The Place of the Foreigner in the Higher Primary School."[31]

East China responded to the times by beginning with determination to achieve recognition by the government. A committee was appointed in 1919 and authorized to continue in 1920. In 1921, this committee, Earl H. Cressy, chairman, was asked to serve as the Committee on Government Relations of the CCEA. Taking advantage of the presence in China of the Educational Commission and of Dr. Paul Monroe in that year, the Committee on Government Relations secured a meeting with three distinguished Chinese educators, all former cabinet ministers, in December, 1921. Here, they came upon the *impasse* of required religious instruction.

> The government educators pointed out the compulsory religious exercises as the chief obstacle to registration. The committee pointed out that their income would cease if this was given up. . . . The educators on the government side said that they had never before fully realized the difficulties of the mission schools in connection with government recognition.[32]

After this, the matter was in abeyance for several years.

CCEA and Chinese Leadership. The Educational Commission had recognized Chinese leadership as the crux of the situation and had recommended its development. Apparently, however, they did so with extreme tact. Dr. Pott, in his presidential address to the CCEA in 1923, said:

> The members of the Commission . . . were evidently surprised by the foreign complexion of our work. It seemed to them that we had transplanted an exotic. Even the architecture of the buildings and the curriculum appeared more foreign than Chinese. They inferred that it was the foreign aspect which prevented our schools from . . . larger Chinese support, and they advocated our giving more control and responsibility.
>
> The time has not yet arrived when we feel that we can hand over the management of our institutions entirely to the Chinese, and yet at the same time we are desirous of making them indigenous in China. The Commission . . . recognized that the number of Chinese qualified to direct our educational institutions is still small, and they did not propose any sudden revolution as regards control.[33]

The Central China Christian Educational Association also pondered this suggestion of the Commission and discussed the topic:

> Should we not forget race distinctions and co-operate between educationists as such, simply by choosing the most suitable persons, and, at the same time, by developing Chinese leadership and experience in the inspectorate and the like in quite a new way? [34]

They decided that they should and voted that the Executive "be empowered to find and train a suitable Chinese Educational Secretary." [35] A Chinese "Educational Secretary," found and trained by the foreign Educational Secretary of the Association, would scarcely be of the calibre to make Christian education indigenous. He would simply carry out the foreigner's ideas. However, under the circumstances, when even the salary of such a person would be a severe drain upon the almost budgetless regional association, there was little more that they could do.

The situation with the national association, however, was more hopeful. One result of the visit of the Educational Commission was that, through their good offices, Dr. Gamewell was able to secure an annual grant of $12,000, U. S. currency, for the CCEA. This came from the Institute of Social and Religious Research and was contingent upon the securing of an equal amount from the mission boards and other sources.[36] It resulted in the immediate announcement that Sanford C. C. Chen, professor in the department of Education at Southeastern University, Nanking (government), and professor of Chinese at the University of Nanking (mission), had accepted the position of Associate General Secretary with Dr. Gamewell's successor, Dr. Wallace of the China Educational Commission and formerly General Secretary of the West China Christian Educational Union. (Only recently, since all East China has moved West, has this regional association fallen in with the general usage as regards its name.) Mr. Chen was an able Chinese scholar, well-qualified to edit the Chinese counterpart of the *Educational Review*. He was to assume his new duties on September first, 1924, when, after many years of waiting, Chinese Christian education would have strong Chinese leadership. But before this date arrived, the storm had broken. He had been secured in the nick of time, and his services to the Association during the critical years immediately following—literally the last years of his life—were invaluable.[37]

The College Group and Indigenization. The first group of missionary educators who made serious preparation for the day when "missionary" education would become "Christian" education was the Association of Colleges and Universities. This group, organized in 1915 on the basis of two administrative representatives from each member institution—the president and one other—decided in 1923 to throw open the membership to "every member of a Christian college staff who is willing to join." [38] There were two main reasons for this: (1) the need to bring the Christian colleges in line with government colleges, *i.e.*, to vocationalize them, and (2) to discover and develop potential Chinese leadership.

The First College Conference met at Ginling College, Nanking, Feb. 5-7, 1924, and was attended by approximately 250 persons, one fifth of whom were Chinese. (Some were Christian educators from government institutions.) [39] At this time the discovery was made, and confirmed by the Second College Conference, in 1926, that Chinese leadership did not have to be developed, but recognized. It was the Chinese and not the Westerner in these two College Conferences who had the vision without which a people—or a group—perish. After the Conference of 1924, and again in 1926,[40] the missionaries paid tribute to their colleagues.[41] One section, at least, of missionary educators had begun to prepare for the day when missionary institutions would become Chinese Christian institutions and, as such, be a part of the educational system of China.

MISSIONARY EDUCATION UNDER ATTACK

First and Second Attacks, 1924. The smoldering antagonism which was reported by P. C. Hsü, in 1920, and by the Minister of Education, the Hon. Fan Yuan-lien, in 1921, and which flared up in the Anti-Christian Movement, in the spring of 1922, again came into the open at the Third Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education, July 3-9, 1924, in Nanking. Taking advantage of the situation in Manchuria, where the Japanese were opening primary schools for political reasons, the Communist element joined forces with the nationalists and attempted to secure the passage of resolutions by which (a) all schools should be graded "A" or "B" by the government, and (b) any school teaching religion should be debarred from classification in the "A" group. Only the first resolution was passed.[42] There were present a sufficient number of the well-informed to prevent the radicals from sweeping into one basket all "foreign" educational work, whether conducted by the Japanese for political ends, or by Christians and Mohammedans for religious ends.[43] But three months later, at the National Federation of Provincial Associations in Kaifeng, October, 1924, the radicals were sufficiently organized to win the passage of resolutions (1) recommending the separation of religion and education and (2) strongly condemning all educational work by "foreigners" as a form of "colonization." [44] These recommendations were sent to the Board of Education at Peking. There was little likelihood that the Board of Education could act upon them; nevertheless, they served the purpose of unsettling the minds of teachers and students by focusing public sentiment against the Christian schools.

Editorial Response. How seriously the recommendations were taken can be gauged from Dr. Wallace's editorials. Following the first attack, at Nanking, he claimed that it was a case of "misunderstanding" and that as soon as the Chinese public learned the truth concerning the Christian schools—as they soon would through the pages of the Chinese *Educational Quarterly* under Sanford Chen's editorship—such attacks would cease. He urged missionary teachers to join the National Association for the Advancement of Education as one means of making the true nature of Christian schools understood, pointing out that it was through the moderate counsels of men who were acquainted with the Christian schools that the radicals had been defeated.[45] Further editorials made no claim that it was a case of "misunderstanding," but recognized that the attack was being steered by those "who know exactly what they are doing." [46] In the next issue of the *Educational Review*, there are ten pages of apologetics for Christian education in answer to the charges that it was "denationalizing," "imperialistic," "a rival system," "an agency for propagating religion," and "undemocratic." [47]

Christian Schools Under Attack. During the next three years (1924-1927), opposition became more specialized and concrete. The two brands of propaganda, the nationalist and the communist, attacked, not only mission education in general, but mission institutions in particular, causing agitation and unrest among both teachers and students. Sanford Chen left no doubt as to his own attitude between the two brands of attack. The Young China Society, he said, was not destructive, but wished to see Christian schools registered with the government, shorn of their "foreignness," and transformed into Chinese institutions. They also wished a complete separation of education and religion.[48] His proposals for meeting their demands included registration with the government, more friendly relationships with government education (which he was well-qualified to promote), and the concentration of one of the Christian universities on Chinese language, literature, history, and philosophy. This he advocated as a means of making Christianity "permanently Chinese." [49] He also expressed the view that better methods of religious education should be introduced:

> With reference to religious instruction, we believe . . . that the method of teaching religion should be improved or the subject should be dropped.[50]

Of the Communist group he said:

> The means they use are rather destructive. What they want is to abolish Christian schools and to confiscate Christian church and school property as the Russians did. The trouble in Hunan shows the striking contrast between the Young China Society and the Communists. The trouble was started by the former. What they desired was to bring Christian schools into closer relationship with the government so that certain important improvements could be made. Therefore they demanded that Christian schools should be registered and be brought under government supervision. But the radical Communists interfered, and they opposed government registration and incited students to transfer to other institutions.[51]

One of the methods used by the Communists was to "plant" students in schools–government and mission–as "cells". These agitators passed on a propaganda which was both true and false. It was one thing to say that unequal treaties should be abolished; that English should not be emphasized at the expense of Chinese; that the schools were supported by members of what they called "capitalist" countries. It was quite another to say that Christianity stood for capitalism; that the schools were supported by "capitalists" for the spread of capitalism; that English was taught in order to denationalize Chinese and make them obedient subjects for foreign nations; that missionaries were engaged in spreading "economic imperialism," and the like.[52] In the face of the situation, Mr. Chen concluded as follows:

> As to the Communists, we know that all the liberal leaders are against them. What will be done with them is a national problem, not a problem of the Christian church. It will be solved by the nation.[53]

In 1925, the annual meeting of the National Federation of Provincial Educational Associations passed a resolution sponsored by the same element, *i.e.*, the Nationalist-Communist coalition, to the effect that

> . . . all provincial educational authorities should be requested to devise means whereby teachers and pupils who leave Christian schools may be received into other institutions.[54]

This was a tacit admission that agents were at work to break up Christian schools and that there should be greater educational facilities provided for the teachers and students who were won over.[55] Troubles in Christian schools mounted under such circumstances.

> A study of what has occurred in a number of institutions indicates that the immediate cause of trouble is almost always some internal difficulty . . . (which) under ordinary circumstances . . . could be cleared with small difficulty. . . .
>
> What are the forces that are taking advantage of these possibilities of trouble inside a school or are introducing into it trouble makers? . . . That there is an anti-Christian movement is unquestionable . . . but . . . what has given power . . . to wreck a school is that the forces of destruction have allied themselves to the great flood tide of national spirit which is sweeping over China. . . . Unless we can make it clear that the purpose of the Christian school is fundamentally one with the best aims of the Nationalist Movement in China, our days are numbered.[56]

SOME RESULTS OF THE ATTACKS

A Call for Treaty Revision. As education was the first missionary activity to be attacked, so educational missionaries were the first to become aware of the injury the treaties were to their work and to demand treaty revision. Dr. Wallace wrote:

> One word of warning may be permitted. Whatever else is done, or left undone, there should be no reliance on the part of missionary educators upon "treaty rights," upon "the rights of extraterritoriality" for the maintenance of the Christian schools. That would be fatal. It would seem final proof to our opponents that the Christian schools were, as they are charged with being, in reality the agents of foreign powers; and it would make it impossible for Chinese Christian leaders to support the schools, and to win for them a place from the governmental authorities.[57]

At the annual meeting of the CCEA, April 1-2, 1925, the General Board passed a resolution that the time had come for "a thorough inquiry on the whole subject" [58] of special privileges for foreigners working in China, and appointed a committee to work with a similar committee which they hoped would be appointed by the National Christian Council, to meet a few weeks later.[59] No defense of the treaty status appeared in the *Educational Review* during this period. The *Chinese Recorder*, which represented the entire missionary body, had articles and letters, *pro* and *con*, on the subject of the treaties after July, 1923. Both the CCEA and the NCC had appointed committees to make recommendations on the treaties before the May 30 Incident, 1925.

Listening to the Non-Christian Point of View. A second noticeable result of the attacks was the appearance in the *Educational Review* of a number of articles presenting the non-Christian point of view. Two articles in the July issue, 1925, were of this sort: the first, by Dr. Hu Shih, the second, unsigned. In an editorial entitled "As Others See Us," Dr. Wallace commended Hu Shih's brilliant analysis [60] as well as the kindly, acute, and constructive criticism in "Some Friendly Critics." [61] Of the former Dr. Wallace said:

> For this brilliant analysis of the situation in China we are grateful. . . . With some of his conclusions we are in cordial sympathy: from others we are forced to dissent. Christian schools and colleges have been established on the conviction . . . that there are permanent spiritual values in the universe which a man fails to secure at his peril, and that education that ignores religion is incomplete and leaves the child with undeveloped reactions to the most significant aspects of reality. It is well to have this issue frankly stated, and by so courteous and able a thinker as Dr. Hu Shih.[62]

Dr. Hu Shih's article presented the new rationalism and the new nationalism confronting the missionary in 1925, and expressed a doubt that the missionary of 1925 realized the position he was in, or understood the problems he was called to face, or recognized the full significance of the enterprise upon which he was engaged. After outlining the five planks of the Nationalist platform–autonomy in five spheres: customs, juridical, educational, religious, national–Dr. Hu Shih presented his views of the new rationalism, concluding with demands for changes in connection with the place of religion in the schools.[63]

The Improvement of Religious Education. The slogan left by the Burton Educational Commission–"more efficient, more Christian, more Chinese"–expressed one of its findings: the exceedingly poor quality of religious education in many of the schools. In this finding the Commission confirmed the judgment of many missionaries and Chinese. In the colleges and in the girls' middle schools, the quality of religious education and chapel services was on a higher level than in many of the boys' middle schools. Luella Miner wrote:

> A sensitive observer visiting our Church schools in North China would probably share my conviction that in our entire educational program our most conspicuous failure is in religious education, that in religious education our weakest point is school worship, and that in school worship our most painful defects appear in boys' middle schools.[64]

The reorganization of the CCEA in 1924, along the lines suggested by the Educational Commission into four Councils, included a Council on Religious Education. The recommendation had been made before the flare-up of the Anti-Christian Movement in the spring of 1922. In 1925, Chester S. Miao became the Secretary for this Council, and in that same year there were articles on religious education covering the whole range from university to primary school by J. Leighton Stuart, T. C. Chao, and William Hung, all of Yenching University; by Dr. Luella Miner, of Shantung Christian University; by D. Trumbull Huntington, bishop of the diocese of Anking; and others. Five papers on this subject had been prepared in connection with the College Conference in 1924, one of which, by Dr. Miao, was published in 1925. Before 1924, apart from the remarks on the subject of compulsory chapel and Bible classes by the Minister of Education, Fan Yuan-lien, and the reply by Dr. Pott in his presidential address to the annual meeting of the Advisory Council in 1921, there were three articles, one *pro* and two *con*, on the subject of compulsory chapel. These were provoked by the criticisms of the Minister of Education and appeared, one in 1922, and two in 1923.[65] More space was given to religious education in 1924, and again in 1925, than in all three preceding years, 1921-1923, taken together. In 1926, the entire January issue was devoted to the subject.[66] It cannot be said that the Anti-Christian Movement produced the Religious Education Movement, but, undoubtedly, it greatly stimulated the cause of religious education.

Speeding Up of Devolution. The process of devolution, already begun by the college group, was hastened in the CCEA by the attacks of 1924. In April, 1925, the Associate General Secretary, Dr. Wallace, wrote that only Chinese citizens were in a position to ask that their rights to religious and educational freedom be respected and that ultimately only Chinese citizens would be in a position to decide the form and content of the education given in the Christian schools.

> No more vital problems than these now face the Chinese Christian leaders of China; and they are problems which they alone can handle. . . .[67]

And of the schools, Dr. Wallace said:

> As "mission schools" their days are numbered; as "Christian schools" under effective Chinese leadership their influence may be only at its dawning.[68]

The tenth annual meeting of the CCEA was held in the same month, and this meeting passed a statement of educational principles the eighth clause of which was entitled: "Christian education becoming indigenous." This read:

> While Christian schools in China were originally established and are still largely maintained by foreign missionaries and their supporters in the West, their purpose has been to serve the best interests of the Chinese people. It is their ideal, which is being increasingly realized, that Christian education should become Chinese in spirit, in content, in support and in control. This is the expressed purpose not only of Chinese and western Christian educators, but also of the mission bodies which have in the past supported the Christian schools, and of the Chinese Christian community which is gradually taking over their support and control.[69]

Commenting upon this statement editorially, Dr. Wallace reiterated:

> Once again, . . . in spite of all the difficulties involved, the only possible hope of a permanent contribution to the life of China from Christian education is dependent upon its being transformed from "mission" to "Chinese Christian" education.[70]

The CCEA took steps in line with this conviction at the annual meeting when this statement was adopted.

> The China Christian Educational Association accepts this principle and acted upon it at the recent annual meeting. The new Council of Primary and Secondary Education appointed as its chairman, Mr. King Chu, M.A., a leading Christian educator in Shanghai. [Note: in the Commercial Press.] Dr. F. L. Hawks Pott, to whose vision and faith the Association has owed much for many years, on the eve of his furlough retired from the presidency of the General Board. His successor is a former student of his own, Dr. Timothy Tingfang (T. T.) Lew, of Yenching University. Action was taken inviting Dr. C. S. Miao, of Shanghai College, to become Secretary of the Council of Religious Education. . . .[71]

While this statement went on to use the old *clichés* which linked "support" and "control", the practice ignored it. It was necessary, if Christian schools were to survive, to put Chinese in control, but the time-honored formula was inserted—probably to prevent protest from members of mission boards who were far removed from the tumult and shouting of Young China.

Renewed Negotiations with the Government. The CCEA, having effected changes in its personnel by bringing in Chinese, Sanford C. C. Chen and Chester S. Miao, to its headquarters, and having elected a Chinese president, Dr. Lew, was now in a position to deal directly with the Board of Education. The members of the new Committee on Government Relations were: Sanford C. C. Chen, chairman, T. T. Lew, David Z. T. Yui, J. Leighton Stuart, Earl H. Cressy, King Chu, and C. Y. Cheng. This was a committee which really represented Christian education, and it achieved results.

Christian Schools and Government Recognition

The Peking Government Issues Terms for Registration. Prior to 1925, the government had met all overtures with "dignified coldness and polite indifference" and "Christian institutions were politely kept outside of the system."[72] Approached by Chinese citizens, however, the government issued new regulations, offering Christian schools the status of "private" institutions. The obnoxious term "foreign schools" was no longer applied. The terms were as follows:

Registration of Christian Schools

1. Any institution of whatever grade established by funds contributed from foreigners, if it carries on its work according to the regulations governing various grades of institutions as promulgated by the Ministry of Education, will be allowed to make application for recognition at the office of the proper educational authorities of the government according to the regulations as promulgated by the Ministry of Education concerning the application for recognition on the part of the educational institutions.

2. Such an institution should prefix to its official name the term "*ssu li*" (privately established).

3. The president or principal of such an institution should be a Chinese. If the president or principal has hitherto been a foreigner, then there must be a Chinese vice-president, who shall represent the institution in applying for recognition.

> 4. If the institution has a board of managers more than half the members of the board must be Chinese.
>
> 5. The institution shall not have as its purpose the propagation of religion.
>
> 6. The curriculum of such an institution should conform to the standards set by the Ministry of Education. It shall not include religious courses among the required subjects.[73]

As might be surmised, the only clauses which proved difficult to the majority of missionary educators were clauses 5 and 6. Some were willing to accept the terms as they stood. For the benefit of these latter, the decision reached at the annual meeting, 1925, urging that no school seek registration until a definite policy could be adopted, was revoked. In the face of the difficulty presented by clauses 5 and 6, the following resolutions were passed:

> (1) That a group of persons be sent to present, informally, to the Ministry of Education the desire of Christian schools to register and the difficulties facing them, and to seek a solution to the problem.
>
> (2) That we urge the Christian educational institutions to put Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, and the first part of Clause 6 of the Regulations of November 16, 1925, into effect as rapidly as possible.
>
> (3) That Christian educational institutions which are prepared to register under the Government Regulations of November 16, 1925, do so.[74]

Things were in this state in the summer of 1926 when the Southern government (Kuomintang) launched the Northern Expeditionary Force under Chiang Kai-shek, commander-in-chief, which marched up, one section through Fukien and the other through Kiangsi and Hunan, to the Wu-Han cities. Wuchang was under siege from September 1 to October 8, 1926, and with its fall, the Kuomintang capital was removed from Canton to Hankow (across the river from Wuchang).

The Kuomintang Issues Terms for Registration. In November, 1926, a year after the Peking Ministry of Education had issued terms under which schools established with funds from abroad might be registered, the new Nationalist Government (the Kuomintang) did likewise. There were differences, however, summarized by Dr. Wallace as follows:

> The Peking regulations allow a foreign principal in schools where there is one already, in which case there shall be a Chinese vice-principal; and state that where there is a board of managers the majority of members shall be Chinese. The Southern regulations are more thoroughgoing. The school must have a Chinese principal and there must be a board of managers of whom the chairman and the majority of the members shall be Chinese. "In special cases, the school may invite (a foreigner) to be an adviser."
>
> . . . The Southern regulations make the same requirement (*re* curriculum), but go on to require rather close control of the school by the educational authorities.
>
> . . . The Southern regulations simply forbid "religious propaganda in class instruction." (They do not mention that the aim of the school must not be propagation of religion.)
>
> . . .
>
> No steps seem to be contemplated by the Peking authorities to compel schools to register. In the South it is definitely stated that "all private schools which have not yet registered shall apply for registration within the prescribed date. . . ." In Kwangtung and Hunan, at least, April, 1928, has been announced as the date by which registration must be effected.[75]

Similarities seemed to be that both sets of regulations offered the status of "private" schools; that both governments were determined that there should be no "compulsory religious education" ("Otherwise there is freedom to teach religion and to conduct religious services."); that both governments were determined to bring all private schools under government supervision, under Chinese administration, and into conformity with course-of-study and curriculum requirements.

This analysis of the similarities and differences in the two sets of regulations was presented in the editorials of the *Educational Review*, January, 1927, and missionary educators were urged to hesitate no longer, but to accept the situation and go forward in faith.

> After all, neither the Christian religion nor education has ever insisted . . . upon ideal conditions or terms of its own choice.[76]

"A Confused Situation"

Suddenly, however, almost before this issue was off the press, unexpected developments in Central China followed upon the removal of the capital from Canton to Hankow. So far from being forced to register, every Christian school in Hunan, with one exception, was forced to close, even the two which were already registered.[77] In Hupeh, the situation was the same. In view of these "grave developments," the CCEA Executive commissioned both secretaries to go to Hankow and interview the authorities. Most of the April, 1927, issue was devoted to reports of what was happening in areas where the Kuomintang had secured control, and the first editorial was entitled "A Confused Situation."

The condition of affairs as reflected in Dr. Wallace's interviews with Sidney Wei, one of the Educational Commission who had drafted the regulations, on the one hand, and with Eugene Chen and Comrade Borodin on the other, was exactly the same situation which Sanford Chen had analyzed in 1925.

Dr. Sidney Wei represented the official Kuomintang position, which was not destructive. The nationalist aim was educational autonomy. Dr. Wei's views were:

> The Nationalist government is not opposed to Christian schools nor were its regulations prepared with any intention of compelling them to close.
>
> Education is a function of the state, and the state should exercise control over all types of schools. This includes missionary schools which must be registered with the government and be under its control.[78]

Mr. Eugene Chen was less clear.

> In reply to my question: "Does the Nationalist government desire to see Christian schools continue?" Mr. Chen replied: "I cannot give a categorical answer yes or no. It depends upon certain considerations."
>
> "Then what should Christian schools do to adjust themselves to the new situation so that they will be welcomed by the Nationalist government?"
>
> Answer: "We appreciate what Christian schools have done. . . . They have been the pioneers. The Nationalist government is now trying to establish a new regime. . . . All schools must . . . assist in the establishment of such a regime. . . . Hence we welcome schools that are in sympathy with our objects.[79]

Comrade Borodin, when interviewed by the then Dean Francis C. M. Wei, said that registration was not the most important matter.

> We cannot consider any Chinese individual or group of Chinese that is neutral to the revolution. If you are neutral, we cannot protect you. If you are against us, we will be against you. . . . Registration is not the most important

> thing, but attitude. Express the right attitude and formal registration is a secondary matter.[80]

This rift between the original Kuomintang, or Nationalist group, and the Communist element which had been taken into the Kuomintang, was suddenly laid bare in the shocking events in Nanking, March 24, 1927. Hunanese troops, wearing Kuomintang uniforms and acting under orders, looted the homes of Westerners and killed a few before a barrage of shells permitted the evacuation of the Westerners to the safety of the gun boats, which were in port. Many Westerners owed their lives that day to the protection of their Chinese friends who hid them from the soldiers. This attack brought about a general evacuation by the consuls of all their nationals from interior China, and marked the end of an era.[81]

CHAPTER IX

China Under the Kuomintang, 1927-1937

Unification and Reconstruction, 1927-1928

WHEN the Kuomintang, under the leadership of General Chiang Kai-shek, established its capital at Nanking on April 18, 1927, less than a month after the attack upon Westerners by the army sent by the so-called Kuomintang capital at Hankow, there were three capitals in China: the old capital at Peking, and the two capitals on the Yangtse, Hankow and Nanking. It was by no means apparent to foreigners in China at that date which of the three competing groups would win. The Russian-dominated regime at Hankow was the first enemy to be disposed of; and the year 1927, which had opened with the Russians in power, ended, according to one historian, with "a complete break of Communist official power, but by no means of its influence." [1] The Russians returned to Russia, and the Communist armies retreated into Kiangsi where they remained entrenched in mountainous country until 1934. In 1928, Kuomintang armies marched north, to Peking, which capitulated in the summer of that year, when the "Party" was then recognized as the national government. By December, 1928, Manchuria, too, had pledged allegiance.

While the armies were fighting in the field, the government heads in Nanking were planning for the building of a new China: for the construction of roads, bridges, railways, airports; for industrial development; and, above all, for educational reconstruction, which was declared to be "a life and death issue of the new China." [2]

Education had suffered as a result of the manipulation of the Students' Union since 1919 by political forces, of the struggle between North and South, and because of the break into Right-wing and Left-wing Kuomintang after the acceptance of the Communists into the Kuomintang. Nowhere had it suffered more than in Central China where the Left wing had established itself at Hankow, and where they were reported as claiming that propaganda was more important than education in a revolution.[3] The Central Educational Commission, described by a contemporary as "seven educationists of mature mind," [4] were the same men who had been elected in Canton before the Northern Expeditionary Force under Chiang Kai-shek had begun their march to the Yangtze, at the time when all the departments of the government were organized on the soviet pattern. The split in the Kuomintang would seem to be evidenced by the fact that this Commission did not move to Hankow with the rest of the government offices, but remained in Canton until May, when they came to Nanking.[5] There could be no better illustration of the calibre of this group than the manner in which they handled the demands of the Shanghai branch of the Students' Union.[6] They responded with courage and determination, and began immediate measures to end the exploitation of students for purposes of political propaganda, and to effect a reorganization of education "in order to make . . . [it] independent of political atmosphere." [7]

Disasters and Achievements, 1929-1933

Between 1929 and 1933, there grew up a sense of confidence on the part of the Chinese people, both in themselves and in their government, and this developed in spite of almost overwhelming catastrophes. There was the great Yangtse-Valley flood of the summer of 1931, affecting five provinces, when for the first time since the Revolution of 1911 the Chinese government took responsibility for the situation instead of depending upon foreign organizations. There was the invasion of Manchuria by Japan in the autumn of that year, and the two-months' war on Shanghai in early 1932, after which it became increasingly apparent to many that war with Japan was inevitable. The reconstruction program was carried out in the face of this menace, and even in preparation for it. Once again students were exploited for political ends, and almost every school had its "Anti-Japanese Save-the-Country Association." There were the unsuccessful expeditions against the Communists, entrenched as they were in the mountains of Kiangsi, between 1930 and 1934.

On the credit side, there were the achievements of the Ministry of Health, established in November, 1929; of the National Economic Council, established in 1931; of the Commission on Rural Reconstruction, established in 1933. The modernization of cities and the construction of roads had proceeded so far by 1931 that there could be such descriptions as these.

A correspondent from Kwangtung wrote:

> The mental horizon of the people is being extended by the very general opening of public highways all through the country. The people are getting away from the old winding and narrow stone paths which have served their forefathers for generations. They are now getting out on the broad, straight, and sun-lit highways, speeding from place to place, . . . seeing new sights, meeting new people. . . .[8]

And Dr. A. L. Warnshuis, Secretary of the International Missionary Council, revisited China in 1930-1931, and described the changes he found in Amoy, his former mission station, which, except in certain details, might apply also to the changes which had taken place in Nanking, Hangchow, Wuchang, and many other cities.

> Instead of the dark, dirty, narrow streets of old Amoy, there are now straight streets, fifty and sixty feet wide, lighted by electricity. The old streets were paved with stones. . . . The new streets are paved with concrete. . . . [There is] a modern sewerage system. . . . The old low, dark, and dingy shops and houses have almost all been replaced with ferro-concrete buildings of three to five stories high. Plate glass fronts line the principal streets. A fine public park with tea gardens, tennis courts, running track and football field has taken the place of some of the dirtiest parts of the city. Horses, sedan chairs, and burden bearers have given way to automobiles and motor trucks. Two aviation fields receive world visitors frequently. A wireless station looms high. . . . Five modern moving-picture theatres, with the best "talkie" equipment made, furnish amusement.[9]

A NEW CHINA EMERGES, 1934-1937

The significant changes, road construction and other enterprises, and the Japanese menace began to show remarkable results after 1934. In 1935-1936, new railways which connected Peking with Canton, Changsha and Kiukiang with Shanghai (via Hangchow), and Chengchow with Sian, were completed, as well as shorter lines here and there. Bus lines multiplied. In 1936, parties were driving their cars from Shanghai on the coast to Chengtu in the Far West over the new roads which would, the following year, carry one of the great mass migrations of history as people left the coastal provinces for freedom in the West. Long-distance telephone lines, radio, and four main air lines, radiating from Shanghai to Peiping, to Sian and Lanchow, to Chengtu, and to Canton, made the old local independence impossible. Chiang Kai-shek could reach almost any part of China in his private plane or dispatch couriers there within a few hours.

The rise of the war spirit was very marked. In the fall of 1934, for example, all middle-school students were required to wear military uniform. At certain hours of the day—early morning, noon, and late afternoon—the streets were filled with lads in uniform, and the effect was tremendous. Elementary-school children were constructing tanks and airplanes and other war paraphernalia. They were going without their lunches to contribute to the purchase of planes to "save the country." Five planes, the gift of the school children of Anhui province to the Generalissimo on his fiftieth birthday, were presented at the Anking airport on October 10, 1936. Students in Anhui University were being trained in First Aid by Chinese physicians in Anking. "Incidents" between Chinese and Japanese increased.[10]

Finally, there came the much publicized Sian affair, after which the country was united in the determination to resist Japan. The last campaign against the Communists in Kiangsi, in 1934, eliminated them from Kiangsi, but that was all. After the amazing "Long March," lasting a year, when a remnant of the Communists succeeded in eluding all armies sent against them and reaching Shensi, they set up their soviet state. Again, an army was sent against them, under Chang Hsueh-liang. All the world now knows the story of the rapprochement between the Communists and this army, the capture of the Generalissimo by his own troops in December, 1936, when he went to investigate, his weeks of imprisonment at Sian, while China waited the outcome with bated breath, and, finally, his safe return to Nanking. A spontaneous outburst of delirious joy swept the nation on the evening of December 25, 1936, when the radios told of his arrival in Nanking, and the celebration, continued by parades the following morning, will not soon be forgotten by anyone who witnessed it. At last, China was united and ready for the blow which was sure to fall. It came at Marco Polo Bridge, in July, 1937.

Rural Reconstruction and the New Life Movements

Of the various reconstructive movements sponsored by the government in the 1930's, none was of more general interest than the Rural Reconstruction Movement.[11] The National Economic Council, organized in 1931, under T. V. Soong, secured a loan from the United States, and also brought out rural experts from the League of Nations to advise concerning rural reconstruction measures in China. Writing in January, 1934, Dr. E. C. Lobenstine, Secretary of the National Christian Council, reported the presence of the League of Nations advisers, and said:

> One of the outstanding facts of the present situation in China is the widespread interest in rural reconstruction. The government, the educational authorities, businessmen and bankers, and public-spirited citizens generally are coming to realize . . . that the improvement of the lot of the farmer is fundamental to national recovery and progress.[12]

In the same article, Dr. Lobenstine reported the interest of the church in the matter—an interest aroused by the proposal of a new program of rural work at the Jerusalem Conference of the International Missionary Council in April, 1928, and later strengthened by the visit of Dr. Kenyon Butterfield to China in 1930-1931. Mainly because of lack of frank commitment to thorough-going social reform, and lack of comprehensive co-operative planning for concerted action, the church faced the situation without an adequate program. When the proposal came from Madame Chiang in the summer of 1933 that work of rural reconstruction in a given number of districts in southern Kiangsi, recently re-won from the Communists, be undertaken by the Christian churches in Kiangsi, they rose to the occasion and accepted the challenge.[13] The American Board contributed generously in personnel.[14]

Two years after Dr. Lobenstine's article, P. C. Hsü wrote of the Third Annual National Conference of Rural Workers, which had been convened in Wusih, October, 1935, saying that it was now generally admitted that the Rural Reconstruction Movement had become nation-wide and of concern to all sorts and conditions of persons. There was no subsidy of travel, and yet delegates—representing government and academic and private organizations of all descriptions—had gathered from thirteen provinces, and were representative of ninety-nine work organizations. For the first time, he said, invitations were issued to rural reconstruction centers under Christian auspices.[15]

Rural reconstruction was the great concern of the hour. Mass education, co-operatives, farmers' banks, were among the new developments designed to aid the great rural population. As the government worked, so did the church in its sphere. The Christian colleges, theological seminaries, middle schools, local churches—all reflected this concern. The University of Nanking had long been in the field, with its departments of agriculture and forestry. Lingnan, or Canton Christian College, had also long had its department of agriculture. Other Christian colleges added rural departments.[16] Frank Wilson Price was head of the Rural Church Department of Nanking Theological Seminary, and Shunhwachen, a nearby village, was used as the laboratory. Seminary students in this department were required to take courses in the School of Agriculture and Forestry, Nanking University, and their work at Shunhwachen was in terms of the whole life of the people: livelihood, health, education, recreation, and satisfying worship. Local ministers, having the confidence of the people, were able to assist the government agents who came to establish rural co-operatives. It was, indeed, a conservative school or church which did not think in terms of rural reconstruction after 1934.[17]

New Life Movement. Closely allied with rural reconstruction was the New Life Movement which began locally in Nanchang, Kiangsi, in February, 1934, but quickly became popular and expanded into a national movement affecting all classes of people. Students gave their summers to work in the country, arousing the people to the new day, when the country, instead of the family, came first. Mass weddings and simple funerals were popularized, in order to relieve the poor from the terrible burden of debt which these two events usually brought in their train.[18] Courtesy, cleanliness, honesty—these and other simple precepts of the New Life Movement—were taken very seriously between 1934-1937. Red caps at the new stations handed back money, pointing to the station rules on the wall, and told you that you had overpaid. As to the origin of the New Life Movement, there are various views. One Chinese author suggests that it grew up in the Generalissimo's mind as a countermeasure to Communism.[19] Certainly, the Communist championing of the farmer and the ruthless slaughter of landlords in Kiangsi, followed by a redistribution of the land to the peasants, had had its quickening effect upon the national conscience.

Student Unrest

One ominous note struck by the Christian educators, J. Leighton Stuart, George W. Hinman, and others, after 1935 was the jobless college graduate.[20] Sun Yat-sen had found his opportunity to enlist his earliest followers and martyrs among students who were hoping to achieve a civil-service position through the prestige of having studied a few months in Japan. The Executive Secretary of the Student Division of the YMCA wrote in 1937:

> The most outstanding perplexity is one of unemployment after graduation. . . . According to . . . Dr. Wang Shih-chieh, Minister of Education, the so-called "jobless graduates" are about thirteen per cent of the 15,200 graduates of 1933 and 1934. But he pointed out that three fourths . . . were students of arts and law. That explains why the Ministry of Education now lays greater emphasis on natural sciences and vocational training. During the past few years, students have taken a deep interest in the task of rural reconstruction. . . . We begin to see, however, an increasing feeling of disillusionment about . . . isolated rural experiments as fundamental solutions of China's problem. The interrelatedness of political and economic problems seems to be too obvious to ignore. Personal perplexities have intensified the social and political-mindedness of the students. . . .
>
> The outcry for individual development is now changed to one for a collective struggle. . . . The concern for an individual "way out" is now changed to an actual identification with the masses. . . . The world crisis is no longer interpreted in terms of a recurring cycle but as the end of an era.[21]

The "nationalist" of 1927, who wanted to see China strengthened to the point where it might set its own pace in the assimilation of Western culture, became the "fascist" of 1937, according to the definition of fascist given in this same article. While the Christian colleges, the writer says, are free from political maneuvering and police raids, "the squabble between the leftists and the fascists is nothing unusual."

> The leftists stand for a Marxian philosophy, a change of the *status quo*, a "united front," and a stronger policy toward Japan. The fascist students stand for unquestionable support of the existing government, obedience to a national

> leader, and national unification through regimentation. The leftists are generally very active in the National Salvation Movement. But there has been a great movement of expulsion of these elements from the Christian institutions, especially in North China.[22]

The reading of students, we are told, is in the field of the social sciences.

> Among the 9,223 volumes produced in 1935, about thirty per cent are books on the social sciences. These are generally written by leftist writers. Dialectic materialism is the striking note of all their writing.[23]

The Christian One Per Cent

As has been pointed out, the Christian community emerged after 1927 as patriotic Chinese. Lewis Hodous wrote in 1928:

> It is an evidence of the Christian church, both in China and the West, that this group was loyal to China, and had no part in the betrayal of China. This cannot be said of other Chinese groups who enjoyed the protection of the West. The growth of the nationalistic spirit was felt by this community. . . . The winds of the revolution soon swept away the semiforeign atmosphere which enveloped the church. The Chinese Christians demonstrated that they were nationalists.[24]

Sun Yat-sen, the Father of his Country, had died a Christian, and had a Christian funeral conducted by Dr. T. T. Lew, assisted by Dr. Y. Y. Tsu, now Bishop Tsu. The Generalissimo had married into a Christian family and had been baptized into the Methodist church, mainly through the influence of his mother-in-law, and many Christians were prominent in government circles. Such movements as the

Rural Reconstruction and New Life Movements were in line with Christian interests and it was a conservative church or school, indeed, which was not affected by them. Furthermore, many of the leaders in both these Movements were Christians. There was James Yen, of Yale, pioneer in the mass education movement. The first General Secretary of the New Life Movement when it began in Kiangsi was a former YMCA secretary, Paul Yen, and the first General Secretary when the Movement took on national proportions was also a Christian, Colonel J. L. Huang, then son-in-law to David Z. T. Yui. The rural reconstruction of Kiangsi province was undertaken by Mr. Chang Fu-liang, of Yale, who, conscious of the national significance of the opportunity, felt obligated to resign his position as Rural Secretary of the National Christian Council when called to Kiangsi. While Christians were few in number—Catholics and Protestants together only one per cent of the population and the Protestants outnumbered by more than two to one—their influence during these years was out of proportion to their numbers.

There was another side of the picture for Christians in China after 1923. The *Chinese Recorder* gives an impressive summary of the kidnappings and deaths of missionary martyrs, Roman Catholic and Protestant, 1924-1929, with a reminder that the Chinese Christians have suffered far more.[25] Five years later, there was another impressive list of Protestant missionaries, killed, captured, or "died in captivity," [26] while constant news items from *Fides*, reporting the capture or death of Roman Catholic priests, both Western and Chinese, by Communists are also given in this Protestant journal.[27] Eugene Chen, Foreign Minister of the Hankow regime, had stated to Dr. Wallace in January, 1927:

> Politically, our objection is not to Christianity as a religion, but as a part of imperialism, *i.e.*, the regime of international control. When the latter problem is solved, the

> Anti-Christian Movement will cease. Christianity is connected by most Nationalists with imperialism. When imperialism is done away with, then the movement will cease, unless church and missionary statesmanship brings Christianity into conflict with the Nationalistic aim.[28]

In the large cities, the Anti-Christian Movement was quiescent but not, says T. T. Lew, extinct.[29]

CHAPTER X

From "Missionary" to Chinese Christian Education

DEVOLUTION IN MISSIONARY EDUCATION, 1927-1928

Involuntary Devolution. For months preceding, missionaries and Chinese Christians had been facing together an uncertain future. The shocking events of March 24, 1927, led to hasty evacuation orders from the consuls for all Western nationals in the interior to seek safety in the coastal cities. This left Chinese Christians to face the storm alone. Under the sudden pressure, missionaries often had only a few hours in which to turn over the management of what had hitherto been "their" institutions, in which Chinese were "employees," to the Chinese staff. Seven years after the event it was stated:

> More devolution in the mission movement in China took place in the short weeks of the spring of 1927 than had been accomplished by a decade of talking and planning. In fact, much was crowded into those brief days, often with disastrous results, which should have been done thoughtfully and gradually through the decade previous.[1]

Contemporary accounts bear out this statement. Of 8250 Protestant missionaries in China at the beginning of 1927, (see Appendix A) Frank Rawlinson, editor of the *Chinese Recorder*, reported in June that there were approximately 3000 remaining in China: 1500 in Shanghai, 1000 in other port cities, and approximately 500 in interior cities.[2] He said:

> Devolution has leaped over those slow and orderly processes which many felt should precede it. . . . Of the thirteen Christian colleges, ten are still open, six being dependent upon the Chinese staff only. . . . Humanly speaking, the future of Christianity in China is now with the Chinese Christians.[3]

The Shock of Devolution. The process of this sudden devolution was a painful one, both for the missionary and the Chinese. The missionary was forced out and the Chinese suddenly, under abnormal conditions and under circumstances which permitted no preparation, was asked to shoulder responsibilities for which in normal times he had been deemed inadequate. Dr. Cressy wrote:

> For some decades missionaries have been planning to turn their work over to the Chinese church. They have been waiting until they were good and ready before doing so, and when they were almost prepared to hand over, the present revolution snatched the work out of their hands. Instead of courtesy and thanksgiving there has been confusion and misunderstanding.[4]

Dr. Rawlinson, also, commented on the disorganization of Christian work which had resulted from the suddenness of the transfer and, in evaluating the suffering, said:

> Chinese Christians . . . have often suffered more than their western colleagues for rarely have they had a place to which to flee from danger.[5]

The "danger" referred to, of course, was from the Communist group which was fighting the unequal treaties and which claimed that Chinese Christians were receiving the same sort of backing from the United States and Great Britain that they were receiving from Russia.[6] One of the statements made by Comrade Borodin to Dr. Francis Wei was that trouble might come upon his college at any time, and that it would come from the community, adding that no Chinese, individual or group, could be considered in a non-political light. When Dr. Wei asked what the "right attitude" stressed by Comrade Borodin was, the first question asked in return was: "Do you look to the treaties for protection?"[7] The Communists were a well-organized group, with Party members in many county and provincial bureaus, and the same rift which had come to light between Chiang Kai-shek and Borodin now ran throughout much of the country.

Voluntary Devolution, or Transfer of Control. The problem of policy confronted the missionary administrator forcibly removed from his work and set down in a coast city. The board to which he was responsible looked to him for advice as to whether schools should be continued or closed. If the situation was "confused" in January, 1927, when Dr. Wallace and Sanford Chen traveled to Hankow to interview the "Kuomintang" authorities, it was certainly not clarified by the events of March 24 in Nanking. The five powers whose nationals were involved sent identic notes demanding apology, punishment, and reparations. On April 18, Chiang Kai-shek established a government at Nanking. It must be realized that at this time "Chiang Kai-shek" meant only the name of a general whose armies had taken Wuchang and Shanghai; that in the wake of this success a "Kuomintang" capital had been established at Hankow, following which there were attacks on foreigners; schools, both government and mission, were closed; and many of the Chinese gentry were killed. From all sides there came reports to the missionaries in Shanghai and other coastal cities of Chinese colleagues whose lives were being sought because they were associated with "capitalists" from Western countries. There had not been time to learn what the break between Right-wing and Left-wing Kuomintang meant, and the news of another capital on the Yangtse brought mixed emotions. This meant, not only war between North and South, but war between two southern factions as well. Which of the three groups bidding to be recognized as the legitimate government of China would win–Peking, Hankow, or Nanking? How soon would the issue be determined?

The situation, of course, was much more acute in the Yangtse Valley area and in Kwangtung than in West China. When the Senate of the West China Union University finally completed all the requirements for registration as set forth by the Peking government and so informed the provincial authorities, they were asked by the Provincial Educational Bureau under which government they wished to be registered: Peking, Hankow, or Nanking? As far as the provincial authorities were concerned, they were informed, there was no present urgency to proceed further.[8] The missionary educator in East China was not in the happy situation of being able to go on as usual while the issue was being fought out. If schools were to open in September, decisions had to be made in June, or soon thereafter.

When the July issue of the *Educational Review* appeared, Dr. Cressy's editorials called for loyalty to the struggling regime at Nanking. This Nationalist government demanded educational autonomy while as yet it had not established itself. Dr. Cressy admitted all the uncertainties.

> A revolution is on. Governments are unstable. Educational regulations are confused. Unfriendly groups are many. Sacrifices are demanded which seem to involve fundamental rights.

> All these things are true. But he who expects the situation to become stable soon is more of an optimist than he who plans to go ahead next fall in spite of difficulties. Closer relations with the government are certain to involve complications whether entered now or later. . . .
>
> What is the Christian thing to do? To wait and see what the future will bring forth, or turn to and help build the future? [9]

And again, in answer to those who asked how transfer of control to Chinese administration could be made under existing conditions, before government regulations had become uniform, he replied:

> All of these arguments are true. They can hardly be refuted. The fallacy of the moment is, however, in thinking that foreigners can any longer prescribe the conditions of transfer. True, they can close the schools. That . . . only postpones the problems.[10]

These and later editorials, supplemented by a strong statement from the Chinese delegation to the Jerusalem Conference of the International Missionary Council, 1928, which was worked out on ship en route to Jerusalem, were evidently effective.[11] When the annual meeting of the CCEA was held in May, 1928, after the two-year interim caused by the revolution, H. C. Tsao, successor to Sanford C. C. Chen, reported "a remarkable record" in the reorganization of Christian schools.[12] The Chinese presidents and vice-presidents were:

Yenching University	Wu Lei-chuan, vice-president
Cheeloo University	Peter Chiang, president Li Tien-lu, vice-president
Nanking University	Y. G. Chen, president

Soochow University	Y. C. Yang, president
Shanghai University	Herman C. E. Liu, president
Fukien Christian University	C. J. Lin, president
Lingnan University	W. K. Chung, president Y. L. Lee, vice-president
West China Union University	Lincoln Dsang, president
Central China University	Francis C. M. Wei, vice-president
Ginling College	Wu Yi-fang, president

Five colleges, St. John's University and four in Central China—Yali (Yale), Huping, Lutheran, and Central China—which had been closed since early 1927, were not registered, nor in the stage of making preparation to register. All the other colleges had either registered, or were making preparations to do so. Yenching completed registration under the Peking government, but, when that government fell in the summer of 1928, had to repeat the process. The Peking regulations, it will be recalled, allowed a foreign president and a Chinese vice-president. As the Kuomintang demanded a Chinese president or principal, and as the Chinese were anxious to keep Dr. Stuart as president, Mr. Wu became Chancellor of Yenching University.

With regard to the middle and elementary schools, Mr. Tsao reported:

> Most of the middle and primary schools have completed their reorganization for registration and a number of them are ready to register. From the administrative point of view Christian educational institutions have broken their records of transfer in the last two years.[13]

This was confirmed by Dr. Miao and Frank Wilson Price, Associate Secretaries of the Council on Religious Education, who reported after their survey, 1928-1929, as follows:

> School reorganization and transfer of control have been not only most apparent but also perhaps the most significant development of Christian education in this decade.[14]

EFFECTS OF TRANSFER OF CONTROL

Kuomintang Attitude Toward Christian Schools. The sudden transfer of control, which resulted in some admitted disorganization and in a certain amount of understandable resentment in Chinese who, having been kept out of administration for years, were thrust into it under such difficult circumstances, nevertheless created a favorable sentiment in the country at large toward the Christian schools. For years, the Christians had claimed to have no ulterior motives, but here was evidence.

> Christianity has the attention of China. Most Chinese have not believed that foreigners would ever voluntarily give up control of institutions. It is incredible to any but Christians.[15]

The old suspicions that missionaries were agents, "planted" by Washington or London and taking orders from their governments, and that Chinese Christians were paid agents of these same alien powers, were proved groundless. One of the first signs of Kuomintang approval of the Christian schools came in a series of articles by George Kin Leung in *The China Courier*, a semiofficial daily, in the first week in July, 1927. He said:

> Since in almost every case Christian schools are making valiant attempts to adjust their work in compliance with government regulations, the Kuomintang need have very little fear that such institutions will work against its program.[16]

He decried the slogans which had been used prior to 1927, accusing mission schools of "cultural aggression":

> If China ever needed the constructive influence of modern education, she needs it now when there is "an educational vacuum." [17]

Dr. Hu Shih, also, in an address to the students of the University of Shanghai, spoke of the former slogan, "cultural aggression."

> He assured his hearers that instead of lamenting, they should welcome this "cultural aggression" for the reason that China had much to learn from foreign culture . . . [which was] of vital necessity to the strength and well-being of new China.[18]

The Central Educational Commission at Nanking—the "seven of mature minds," who had refused to proceed with the Borodin regime when the capital was moved from Canton to Hankow in December, 1926—sent out instructions to all provincial bureaus of education that it was the wish of the Commission that Christian schools be allowed to register, and that the public should be notified that no injury was to be done to private institutions through a misuse of the phrase "regain educational rights." Their letter to the CCEA explaining their views and their actions was signed by each member of the commission.[19]

Mr. Leung spoke for the responsible elements in the Kuomintang when he said that whatever good might come from the masses taking an interest in the government, there was always the danger of unprincipled demagogues. Some day, he said, there would be a gigantic system of free schools and compulsory education.

> But how long will it be before money and experience will build up that mighty network? Meanwhile, at least, we must preserve and nurture such constructive educational elements as exist, whether private or governmental.[20]

Naturally, the entire populace did not change overnight. One group wished to expel the YMCA from China as "capitalistic," and it immediately became known through the press that the Generalissimo had made a contribution of several hundred dollars to the work of the YMCA. Another group, the Shanghai Students' Union, wished steps taken to bring St. John's University under government control. This brought the dignified reply that this university was being urged to register, and that until such time as registration was completed the graduates should "not enjoy such privileges as have been enjoyed by those of government or registered private colleges or universities."[21] In every reported instance, the Central Educational Commission at Nanking proved themselves to be what both Sanford Chen and H. C. Tsao had claimed them to be. Mr. Chen pointed out that while much of the trouble of Christian schools locally was due to quasi-governmental organizations—the political training bureaus and hosts of other organizations made up of young and active persons with little or no administrative experience—the higher authorities were of different calibre.

> [They] are more or less mature persons. Most of them are professionally prepared. They see things as a whole. . . . Time and effort are needed to make the government truly centralized.[22]

Rapprochement Between Missionary and Chinese Educators. One reason which some mission-school principals or mission authorities had always urged against Chinese administration was that they would not fight for the "religious rights" of the institution. As Chinese, the Chinese Christian tended to stand by his own constitution which provided for the religious liberty of the individual. No one stood more firmly than Dr. Wallace for the Anglo-Saxon doctrine of the freedom of the institution, but on the question of the desirability of registration, he never wavered. He wrote:

> There is unfortunately a general misapprehension that when Christians claim "the rights of religious freedom," what is really involved is "religious imperialism." This misunderstanding is due to the fact that the immediate issue in religious freedom has been the right of a school to require (or "compel") its students to attend religious services and classes in religion. The more the missionary has urged this "right," the less inclined is the Chinese educator, and the average Chinese Christian, to admit that such a right exists. Since the reluctance of missionaries to register their schools is most often based upon the desire to maintain their religious freedom, many Chinese educators have come to confuse the maintenance of religious freedom with the maintenance of an independent position outside of or alien to the national system of education. One of the advantages of registration is that it clears the religious issue of all foreign or anti-national implications . . . and leaves the important question of religious freedom to be discussed and decided on its merits alone.[23]

The same issue that carries this editorial carries also an article by Y. L. Lee[24] (now president of Lingnan University) on the division between the missionaries and Chinese in Canton *re* the subject of the desirability of registration. This article may have inspired the editorial. According to Mr. Lee, the Chinese were virtually unanimous for registration while the missionaries were against it.

Dr. Cressy agreed with Dr. Wallace on this point. Religious rights in China would never be won by Westerners. If they were to be won at all, Chinese Christians would have to win them, and they would be enabled to fight for the religious freedom of Christian institutions only if given responsibility for those institutions. Closed schools, he pointed out, would never prove what the Chinese Christians would do, but would simply deny them the opportunity to show what they would do.[25] Fortunately, the involuntary devolution which had taken place in the spring of 1927 soon provided evidence on this score. When extremists in the local bureaus of education in Hangchow, Ningpo, Kinwha, and other cities in Chekiang began with their slogans, "Oppose Christian education that paralyzes the youth" and "Regain the control of education," the Chinese who had been left in charge organized themselves, wrote a letter to the Chekiang provincial authorities stating their case, and altogether made a valiant stand.[26] Also, as soon as the responsibility became their own, there was a general shift in the position of the Chinese who had thought the missionaries wrong and the government right. Chinese boards of control, Dr. Cressy reported, were "showing the greatest caution in negotiating with the government authorities." [27] When provincial demands conflicted with the rulings of Nanking, Mr. Sanford Chen took the position that registration could wait until matters were ironed out between the provincial government and Nanking.[28]

In May, 1928, the Annual Meeting of the CCEA took place. It was "with natural curiosity," Dr. Wallace reported, that those who had been connected with the CCEA for many years "watched to see the temper and attitude of the membership of this annual meeting," composed as it was mainly of new Chinese administrators.

> The Chinese membership was at least three quarters of the total. . . . It was rather interesting to note that, speaking generally, some of the missionaries were inclined to be more

> "liberal" than formerly in their attitude on certain big questions, and that there was a decidedly "conservative" swing in the Chinese viewpoint. As a result both seemed to meet at the same point, and there was rather unusual agreement on questions where wide differences might have been expected.[29]

Dr. Wallace concluded his account of the work of this annual meeting with the affirmation that there were abundant signs that those who had placed upon them grave responsibilities for directing the Christian schools and colleges would guard their interests and secure for them a worthy place in the educational system of China.[30] Western and Chinese Christians had come together again.

Alienation of Some Western Supporters. This rapprochement between Western and Chinese Christians in China was of inestimable value in view of another result of devolution: the unhappy reaction of some Christians in the West. Just as the Chinese Christians had demonstrated that they were not denationalized, nor "running dogs of foreign imperialists," and when both missionaries and Chinese were rejoicing in the new status being accorded Christianity in China, there came the distressing news that some who had hitherto contributed generously to the educational work were no longer interested. "China" had slapped them in the face.[31] The situation had not improved a year later, for it was stated:

> The uncertainties and tragedies of the years 1925, 1926, and 1927, in China have been reflected in bewilderment, dismay, and to no small degree the loss of interest and support of many of China's former friends. . . .
>
> The effect upon friends of Christian education has been serious. Donors of school and college buildings have heard of lootings and burnings, and if the buildings they have

> contributed have not suffered, they still fear their loss. Others have heard of criticisms and attacks upon Christian schools by their own students, and they assume that this is a general situation. The withdrawal of missionaries has been taken as having been forced by attacks of the Chinese public generally; the fact that it was due to consular orders is popularly not known or forgotten. . . .[32]

Here was a revelation that there was no realization on the part of some Western Christians that there had grown up a Chinese Christian community, a new branch of the Christian church. They were still proceeding on nineteenth-century ideas of sending missionaries to the Chinese; of owning property safeguarded by treaties; and the like. They also apparently did not distinguish between Kuomintang (Nationalist) and Kungchangtang (Communist)—a not too surprising fact, since the Borodin regime had operated for some time under the name of Kuomintang, so that hundreds of missionaries who returned to the West in 1927 were anything but clear as to what was taking place in China.

Western Christians also read their newspapers and journals featuring the evacuation of missionaries, without featuring that this was carried out under consular orders; the occupation of Christian schools by troops, without mentioning that government schools were also occupied by troops; the desecration of churches, without mentioning the destruction of Buddhist temples and works of art. Here was a last legacy of the connection of Christianity with the treaties. The press reported attacks on what was regarded as American property because it was assumed that this was a matter of interest to a certain group of the American people.

THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ISSUE AND REGISTRATION

The Registration Process. The registration process was long and involved. The qualifications for a registered school included endowment funds, a minimum of equipment, regulations regarding salaries of teachers, and many other matters. The three main issues were curriculum, this had been settled in 1924; Chinese administration, which was settled in the majority of schools by the involuntary devolution of 1927; and the religious issue. As has been stated, it was the position of the educational leadership in the CCEA that the schools should be registered in order that they might struggle for religious liberty, accepting meantime the dictum that chapel and classes in religion could not be required of any student. Because the process of registration was so long and involved, and because the situation was in flux, it is possible that some schools began the process hoping to win the consent of mission authorities before its completion.

Difference of Opinion Between School and Church Groups. A poll of opinion among prominent Chinese and missionary educators brought eighty replies. No Chinese, and only nine per cent of the missionaries thought that the Christian character of the schools was best maintained by the traditional procedures. The overwhelming majority were of the opinion that the personnel of the administrative and teaching staff, the character of the student body, the religious program of the school, all, were the decisive factors in maintaining the Christian character of the institution. There was no strong feeling in this group that the government terms were prohibitive.[33]

Church groups, on the other hand, while approving registration, held a strong sentiment against accepting terms which did not insure that religion held its place as an integral part of the school program. In 1928, the House of Deputies of the Chung Hwa Sheng Kung Hui (Chinese Anglican group) at the Sixth General Synod, composed of sixty-two elected delegates, fifty-three of whom were Chinese, and presided over by a Chinese chairman, the Rev. P. Lindel Tsen (now bishop of Honan), passed a resolution:

> That the House petition the educational authorities of the Chinese government that in accordance with the principle of religious liberty, Christian schools be allowed to require Christian students, with the approval of their parents, to attend classes in religious instruction and services for Christian worship.[34]

This request was not based on the religious liberty of the institution, be it noted, but the religious liberty of a group. Only the children from Christian homes, with the consent of their parents, were to be required to attend chapel and to have classes in religious subjects.

Similarly, the Lutheran group, mainly Chinese, passed a resolution in 1928 which appealed to all other Protestant groups to join with them in a mass petition to the government requesting the right to require chapel and classes in religion for the children of Christians.[35] Knut B. Westman even went so far as to say that if the government would grant this privilege, in his opinion, the Lutherans should reciprocate by giving up the idea of using the school as an evangelistic agency.[36]

With some organizations, it was the mission rather than the Church which settled policy. In 1927, the English Baptist Mission [37] and the China Council of the Presbyterian Church[38] demanded institutional religious liberty. This was going further than the Anglicans and the Lutherans—Chinese Anglicans and Lutherans—had gone.

Because of these differences of opinion, practices were not uniform. In order to discover the facts, and also to assist the middle schools to adjust to a new era, the CCEA sent the two secretaries of the Council on Religious Education, Dr. Chester S. Miao and his associate for the year, 1928-1929, the Rev. Frank W. Price, to visit as many middle schools as possible, and to make a report on all by means of a questionnaire.

The Situation Among Middle Schools. The Miao-Price survey of middle schools showed that there were 200 middle schools in 1928-1929 as against the 339 reported by T. Z. Koo to the College Conference in 1924. Of this number, seventy per cent were either registered, in process of registration, or were making preparations to seek recognition. Even though government pressure to register had relaxed in 1928, there was sufficient pressure from within ("attitude of Chinese teachers and the changing student psychology") to bring this about.[39] There was no uniformity, even in church groups which had voted to hold out for institutional religious liberty.[40]

> The Congregational and Methodist schools adapted themselves most quickly to the government regulations; the Presbyterian Mission has been loath to surrender full religious freedom. . . .[41]

There were many adjustments to be made in the transfer from foreign to Chinese administration; many problems to be solved by the new Chinese principals. We read:

> The new Chinese principals everywhere are facing a multitude of complex administrative problems. Missions often have a large measure of control on account of their financial appropriations to the schools even when responsibility is nominally in Chinese hands. Rising costs, adjustment to government requirements, the securing of able and Christian teachers, the place of the missionary teacher, location of graduates, general educational policy—call for strong thinking and clear vision. It is no easy task for the new Chinese leadership to take over such costly investments of property and equipment and to judge between the demands of supporting constituencies, mission groups, the Chinese church, students and alumni and government authorities.[42]

The Chinese principal, dependent for funds on a mission group who were holding out for "institutional religious liberty" or for the right to have compulsory religious education for the children of Christians, was not a free agent. He stood between financial pressure against registration and the pressure from his own teachers and students for it.

CCEA Pressure To Register. The Miao-Price report that some sixty out of 200 middle schools were not contemplating registration seemed too large a proportion of unregistered schools, and Frank Price put the alternatives forcefully.

> Four roads seem to lie before Christian private schools. The first to which the majority have turned, or are turning, is compliance with the government regulations for registration of all private schools. A second course is that of delay. Let us wait and see whether the government is stable, whether the regulations are enforced, how registered schools are faring. . . . Some schools, however, are finding . . . that delay adds complications. . . . Pressure . . . varies; pressure from within is sometimes greater than government pressure. A third possible way is that of evasion and protest. . . . Ignore the law as an infringement upon the principle of religious freedom and refuse to register unless the law is changed. Protest and continue to run the school as long as possible under the old religious policy. Let us not be satisfied with anything less than complete religious autonomy. . . . A policy which implies defiance of national law naturally meets with considerable opposition. . . . A fourth road would lead to the temporary or permanent closing of the school. . . . The virtue of such a policy seems to be rather negative.[43]

As a further encouragement to those loath to register, a Chinese Christian official was quoted to the effect that there would not be greater freedom for many years to come,[44] and a Japanese college president was cited as having said that the policy of nonregistration of mission colleges in Japan had resulted in a complete dearth of Christian diplomats and officials in that country. No graduate of a Christian college in Japan could hope to get into government office.[45]

New Regulations Bring "Petition of the Chinese Churches." While church groups were protesting the old regulations which made religious education optional, even more stringent rulings were being prepared. On August 29, 1929, new regulations for private schools were issued which not only forbade religion as a required subject but added the new features:

> If there are any religious exercises, students shall not be compelled *or induced* to participate. *No religious exercises shall be allowed in the primary schools.*[46]

This decision that no religious teaching might be given below the senior middle school [47] caused great consternation and concern. Fifteen church and mission groups through their responsible leaders presented a petition to the Ministry of Education. The petition did not follow the line suggested in the Lutheran letter, but the Lutherans joined with the others in requesting that "all grades of church schools" be allowed to have "elective courses," and that the primary grades have the privilege of worship.[48] Four times in the petition the suggestion is made that this ruling, if enforced, will result in the closing of the greater number of Christian schools.[49]

Reply to the Churches from Chiang Mon-lin. The reply of the Minister of Education, Chiang Mon-lin, was as follows (in translation):

> Your petition requesting that all grades of church and mission schools be permitted to have elective religious

courses, and that primary schools be permitted to have the liberty of worship has been received.

Upon consideration of the points raised in your petition, we find them not free from misunderstanding. Let us consider these points seriatim.

(1) The first point, that we should use religious teaching in the training for life, is not far from the truth. But this depends upon whether you utilize in your teaching the ideals of all religions, such, for example, as the teaching of equality and mercy in Buddhism, of universal love and service to others in Christianity; one cannot limit the teachings exclusively to those of one religion. . . .

(2) . . . If we allow any one religion to inculcate exclusively its own principles in non-adults of junior middle-school grade and below, this will preempt their minds and deprive them later . . . of the ability to exercise freedom in the choice of their religion. This is really the placing of shackles upon their liberty of thought.

(3) Since the principal purpose of your churches in establishing schools is to make education widely available and is not intended to employ education to entice or compel students to become church members, therefore the restrictions . . . do not run counter to the prime purpose of the churches in conducting schools.

With regard to the idea that all the children of the 200,000 Christians must be enrolled in church schools, this seems to us to be on the same plane as the attempt to view the world from your own doorstep and such an idea should not continue to be cherished.

(4) If you propose to experiment in education, basing your experiments on projects related to science and social conditions, this is something which the government unquestionably approves and permits. Religion, however, is one type of abstract, intangible imagination and is outside the category of educational theories, and there is therefore

> no reason for the government to permit religion in schools for the purpose of experimentation.
>
> To sum up: There is not only one religion. If we allow each religion in the name of education to vie one with another to propagate religion, the natural tendency will be to create divisions and strife.
>
> Hence to have elective religious courses in junior middle schools and to have the privilege of worship in primary schools embodies obstacles too difficult to permit the Ministry to grant the request. Moreover, we hope that you will consider in a sympathetic way this, our humble opinion, regarding the restrictions upon propagation of religion in schools. Let this be considered final and not subject to further review.
>
> (Signed) Mon-lin Chiang,
> Minister of Education.[50]

Chinese Unanimous on Necessity for Christian Schools. The possibility that the missions would close the schools was very great. Dr. Miao, Acting General Secretary of the CCEA after Dr. Wallace's departure to assume the presidency of Victoria College in the University of Toronto, showed the seriousness with which he regarded the situation by his prompt action in securing the opinions of seven college and university presidents and one dean, which he printed, together with the Petition of the Churches, the Minister's Reply, and a letter written by himself.[51] Without exception, these Chinese leaders felt that the Christian Church in China would be imperiled if all the elementary and junior middle schools should be closed. They were unanimous in feeling that, whatever the restrictions, the schools should be maintained. Some of the views expressed were as follows:

> If we close our schools . . . our children . . . will be thrown out into a social order in which the atmosphere is

> charged with anti-Christian propaganda. In this atmosphere they will live for six days a week. Their ideals and habits will be formed. . . . The little religious teaching they can receive on Sunday can hardly counteract . . . their daily agnostic or atheistic surroundings.[52]
>
> We owe it to the Christian parents [to maintain the schools.] . . . If the children have been exposed too much to the influence of anti-Christian propaganda or sheer secularism in school, the religious teachings of the home will certainly be much impaired.[53]
>
> Take the situation at its worst. We may not be able to do any religious work positively or overtly. But if we have Christian primary schools and junior middle schools we can be sure of at least one thing, that is, as many children as we can take care of in our schools will be protected from anti-Christian propaganda, which is apt to rage over the country at any time.[54]

It is obvious from these excerpts that China was being influenced violently against the Christian religion by her neighbor to the northwest, where the Church had identified itself with the Czarist regime, and also by her own experience with the so-called Christian countries which had encroached upon her sovereignty and humiliated her.

But more clearly than anyone in this group of writers, T. C. Chao pointed out the possibility of wresting victory from defeat. If the church closed the schools because of the government ruling, it would be a victory for the forces fighting for a godless world, and a certain defeat for the church. But what if the church adapted itself to the situation like a living organism, and wrung victory out of defeat?

> If religious worship and the teaching of religion in the classroom are not allowed, . . . they should be given . . . in the church or in some house rented for this specific

> purpose. *There are advantages in this arrangement; . . . it connects the students with the church. This may create a church consciousness . . . which is very much needed today.*[55] (Italics author's)

These words are important for several reasons. They indicate the lines which had already begun to be followed at Yenching University, where the writer was dean, and at other institutions. They came from experience. Again, they are important because they connote the very serious fact that in China the church was without prestige as an institution in society. Finally, they indicate why the Religious Education Movement in the 1930's has a significance that it could not have had in Western countries where the church had the prestige of centuries.

Results of Registration: Education

Following registration, the Christian schools, speaking generally, became really "more efficient, and more Chinese," and—in some institutions—"more Christian." Even those that were unregistered throughout the ten years, 1927-1937, tended to maintain higher standards and to conform in the matter of curriculum and Chinese administration, in order to preserve the good will of the community, and maintain the unregistered status and freedom to give religious instruction.[56]

"*More Efficient.*" The net result of registration upon both registered and unregistered schools under Christian auspices was to limit them quantitatively and improve educational standards. This was especially true of primary schools. The decree that religious instruction might form no part of the curriculum automatically closed a great number. Idabelle Lewis Main wrote in 1933:

> No actual statistics are available for the number of Christian primary schools in China. . . . It is probable

> that several thousand primary schools are under Christian auspices, and that over 100,000 children are studying in these schools.
>
> Registration, with limited religious freedom, has forced the closing of many Christian schools. However, the best schools have become self-supporting and have been taken over by the Chinese churches, and have been registered. Christian parents are determined to have their children educated in schools where a Christian atmosphere prevails.[57]

The closing of many of these schools was no loss, either to education or the church. Ten years before, Dr. Main had written:

> Hundreds of these primary schools are neither Christian nor educational. Thousands of dollars are wasted on such schools annually. . . . It is time we awakened to this fact.[58]

Of the situation in 1933, she said:

> A large number of the schools will continue to live after mission funds are withdrawn. Such as live should be helped in every possible unofficial way. Registration with the government will secure a minimum standard.[59]

Not only were the number of primary schools greatly reduced, but the number of primary pupils, if Dr. Main's estimate of over 100,000 is correct, was less than half of the 251,841 primary pupils reported in 1925.[60]

With the middle schools, on the other hand, although many mergers had reduced the total number of schools from the 339 reported by T. Z. Koo in 1924 to 250 in 1936, the number of students was increased from around 25,000 in 1925 to 50,000 in 1936.[61] There were also 6700 students in the Christian colleges, bringing the total of students in these institutions (middle school and college) to one tenth of the total for the whole country. Ninety per cent of the middle schools and all but one of the thirteen colleges were registered, which gave them the status of recognized "private" schools and placed them in a strong position.[62] Registration had effectively ended the tendency of missionaries to start schools in a small way as they had done from the beginning of pioneer days.

"*More Chinese.*" The merging of Christian education into the national system was immediately reflected in the *Educational Review*. Between 1914 and 1927, Dr. Fong F. Sec was editor of the department entitled "Government Education." This section, usually three to ten pages, reported a world apart. In the two years, 1922-1923, the eight installments totaled 58 pages. Ten years later, 1932-1933, there was no department devoted to "Government Education." Instead, we find 100 pages of such matters as the Report of the League of Nations Commission on Chinese education, "Revised Government Curriculum Standards," "The Present Educational Situation," or of articles on research and experimentation, on creative education, on the part of education in the reconstruction of China, contributed by such well-known educators as W. T. Tao, Chia H. Chuang, Chu Youkwang, C. H. Tsang, *et al.* It was no longer "their" system and "our" system. It was all "ours."

Again, the "more Chinese" quality of Christian education was reflected in the increased number of articles by Chinese Christian educators in both the *Educational Review* and the *Chinese Recorder*. Chinese who wrote on education in either of these journals before 1924 were either Dr. Fong F. Sec or Dr. P. W. Kuo. (Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei and Fan Yuan-lien appear in translation.) Beginning in 1924 we get a long list of Chinese Christian educators—deans, student secretaries, professors, college presidents. There are T. T. Lew, T. Z. Koo, T. C. Chao, Francis C. M. Wei, William Hung, Sanford C. C.

Chen, H. C. Tsao, Chester S. Miao, Y. C. Yang, Y. P. Mei, Y. C. Tu, Y. L. Lee, Kiang Wen-han—to mention the earliest and latest Chinese authors in these years. An examination of the articles on education in the *Chinese Recorder* for the ten years, 1928-1937, shows a total of thirty-one articles contributed by thirteen Westerners and nine Chinese. Of the thirteen Westerners, nine wrote sixteen articles from the standpoint of the college president, or, in the case of Dr. Wallace and Dr. Cressy, from that of the Educational Association, which was concerned with both middle school and college. Nine Chinese wrote eleven articles on education on the college level. Eight were college presidents or professors; the ninth, Kiang Wen-han, was Executive Secretary of the Student Division of the YMCA. From the standpoint of quality, no previous ten years of the *Chinese Recorder's* history can show such articles on educational policy.[63]

Another testimony to the "more Chinese" quality of education in the Christian schools was the entire absence of the type of criticism which had formerly been leveled at the majority of mission schools by missionaries, Chinese Christians, government educators, and non-Christians. In 1915, Dr. Pott has said that a "stigma" rested upon mission schools for their neglect of Chinese studies; that China could neglect the Confucian base of her civilization only at great peril to herself. He urged that missionaries divest themselves of the idea that the Chinese department was the one upon which they could economize. "The prestige," he said, "of our missionary institutions is at stake."[64] The main theme of several papers at the second College Conference (1926) had been Chinese culture. "The New Culture Movement and Christian Education in China," by T. T. Lew; "Synthesis of Cultures of East and West," by Francis C. M. Wei; "Making the Christian College More Chinese," by F. J. White; "The Needs of the Christian Movement in China," by David Z. T. Yui. All these dealt with the need of Chinese Christian scholarship.[65] The following year of revolution which brought the establishment of the Kuomintang at Nanking and resulted in the change from Western to Chinese administration brought an end to this type of agitation. In 1930, T. T. Lew wrote:

> The social sciences have become centers of interest. Classes in economics, politics, and sociology are enlisting many students. The situation is just the reverse of 1920, when philosophy was the most popular subject.[66]

The pendulum had swung away from the emphasis in the Renaissance years, and to be "more Chinese" in this decade meant that middle schools and colleges must be vitally concerned with rural reconstruction, technology, science–in short, with everything that would enable China to survive in the modern world. Educational autonomy had been achieved, and, under Chinese presidents and principals, the Chinese departments would not be slighted, or, if they were, the government could bring pressure.

The trend cited by T. T. Lew in 1930 had swelled to flood-tide proportions by 1937, when Kiang Wen-han said that Hu Shih's periodicals met the need of the "academic" but that the students were reading books by leftist writers among whom the most striking note is didactic materialism. The students, he said, are no longer looking for a "way-out" as individuals, but have changed to "an actual identification with the masses." [67]

"*More Christian.*" The effect of registration upon the religious character of the school varied. While, indubitably, registered schools were more efficient and more Chinese, some registered schools became far more Christian than they had ever been before, others became less so. There could be no doubt of the quality of religious life at Yenching University where such a one as T. C. Chao was the leading spirit in the Yenta Fellowship. His attitude may be glimpsed from the following excerpts:

> We have been led to feel very deeply the unfitness of the old method and basic principles of inculcating religious education. These methods ought fearlessly and positively to be abandoned. When we do abandon them we ought never again to adopt compulsory church services, Bible study, and so on, to achieve the practical applications of religious education. We should do this, moreover, not because of the attacks of outsiders but because we, ourselves, at heart feel this way about it.[68]
>
> We must oppose the "freedom" of using methods which destroy freedom, and the "freedom" of anyone to use bad methods, which deny us the freedom of using the proper way for carrying on religious education.[69]

After noting that in the minds of some the reason for the emphasis upon religious education in the Christian school was that the support of the school depended upon pleasing the benefactors, and admitting that this was, in part, true, Dr. Chao also insisted that if religious education were bad for the students, it should be given up even if it meant closing the school. But for him, religious education was of the utmost importance and should be carried forward "with all speed." [70] What this meant was the creation of a wholesome environment in which religion could thrive: the engaging of teachers of high-academic standards and of high-Christian character; paying attention to the living conditions of the students, and to their character. Then, he says:

> When the social life of the school has been made wholesome, [and] the school has been made wholesome, then the school should emphasize religious worship. Corporate worship is a part of religious education. . . . True worship . . . create(s) in the worshipper a proper attitude

> toward God and toward man. When teachers and students of their own free will, prepare for the service, practice music, decorate the chapel, arrange the program . . . even though this may be the action of the few, it will certainly have an influence on many, causing reaction or creating opposition, attracting attention or rousing interest. This is free worship, open to all; it is religious education of the students and teachers by themselves. All principals and teachers who are enthusiastically religious will certainly promote this kind of worship with all their might, and make it their plan to attend the meetings themselves.[71]

In virtually all the colleges and in the better middle schools, this type of thinking about religious education came to be the rule.[72] Gordon Poteat, returning to China in 1931, after an absence of four years, reported on the situation at the University of Shanghai as follows:

> The present situation in the University of Shanghai looked at from the standpoint of its Christian spirit and activities is, under the administration and leadership of the Chinese, better than it ever was in the past. As a student worker in America, both before coming to China and during 1927-1928, I have had occasion to visit a great many American colleges which were established by Christian groups, and I can recall very few which come up to the mark at which the University of Shanghai stands today. This testimony has been confirmed by others who know both American Christian colleges and this school.[73]

In the course of the article he reported a "Religious Emphasis Week," which began with the Sunday morning service and continued with evening meetings throughout the week. On the last evening, Dr. Fong F. Sec was the speaker, on the topic: "Why I am a Christian."

> Dr. Fong expressed great astonishment when on that evening he was confronted with an audience of over three hundred students [out of a possible 500] who listened enraptured to his recital of his personal experiences. He remarked to the audience that he thought he would be meeting a small group, as he had heard so much about the opposition of students to religion. During the same week, I was speaking twice daily to the Middle-School boys, averaging over two hundred in attendance out of about 450.[74]

Finally, there is the testimony of an Englishman on the staff of Central China College, Wuchang—a coalition after 1927 of Yale-in-China, of the American Episcopalian institution (Boone), the Reformed Church in the United States, the London Missionary Society, and the (English) Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. In a report on a conference of the Chinese middle-school principals of Central China, David F. Anderson wrote:

> The program of the conference was to some extent an answer to those in England and America who see in registration with the government a compromise with Mammon and a crippling of the effectiveness of our Christian schools. Whatever the position may have been three or four years ago, this issue is simply not alive now (1933) in Central China.[75]

Nevertheless, the situation religiously grew increasingly difficult for the Christian middle schools. The world-wide depression affected the income of mission boards; and a corresponding decreased income for the schools, plus the increased expenditures for scientific apparatus, teachers' salaries, and so on, brought about by registration, could result in but one thing: higher fees. This, in turn, could end only in forcing students from poor Christian families to attend the government schools, where costs were lower, and in bringing into the church schools the sons of the wealthy. With a constantly shrinking number of Christian students in a school where religious activities were on a voluntary basis, and dependent to a great degree upon the initiation of students, the Christian middle schools differed less and less from government middle schools. In both, there were small Christian Fellowships. Dr. Cressy reported in 1936 that the proportion of Christian students in the colleges varied from 95 per cent to 23 per cent, and that the dwindling of Christian students in the middle schools would soon be felt in the colleges. He urged that 250 middle schools were, under the circumstances, too many and that more of these should merge.[76]

In the case of the elementary and junior middle schools, where the law of the land had decreed that religious activities might not be a part of school activities, even on a voluntary basis, they became, perforce, extracurricular. There were many Christian teachers in the lower levels who agreed with T. C. Chao as to the importance of religious education. A second-grade teacher in Grace Church School, Anking, after consultation with the author, organized a Children's Church. Out of some 200 children, 70 responded. These were the children from Christian homes and some of their friends. They instituted a Children's Church, with weekday activities, from 1929-1934, after which time the older members of the group became the Young People's Fellowship. That this situation was not too unique is shown by Mrs. Main's statement concerning elementary schools:

> Probably about 21 per cent to 25 per cent of the children are from Christian families, and over 75 per cent . . . from non-Christian homes. About 60 per cent to 70 per cent of the children attend church and perhaps the same proportion attend voluntary chapel service. All of these services are held outside school hours and are held with the full knowledge of the local educational authorities.[77]

The quality of religious education varied as widely in the elementary schools, of course, as it varied in the middle schools.

RESULTS OF REGISTRATION: CHURCH

Concern for Religious Education. The action of the government in requiring registration made religious education a prime concern of the churches. In consequence, the Council on Religious Education, brought into existence in 1924 in the general reorganization of the CCEA in that year, became increasingly important. In 1930-1931, with the cooperation of the World Sunday School Association, the National Christian Council and the CCEA undertook a survey of the needs of the Chinese churches with regard to religious education. A deputation of five—Jesse Lee Corley, representing the World Sunday School Association; Ronald D. Rees, Secretary of the National Christian Council; Chester S. Miao, at this time both acting General Secretary of the CCEA and Secretary for the Council of Religious Education; Samson S. Ding, Chairman of East Asia Central Conference on Religious Education; Alice Gregg, Secretary of the Religious Education Committee of the Chung Hwa Sheng Kung Hui—visited twenty-seven cities in some ten provinces, making excursions into rural areas.[78] Following this year's study, a national interdenominational organization, the National Committee for Christian Religious Education (NCCRE), came into existence, in 1931.[79]

Rise of the Religious Education Movement. The first All-China Religious Education Conference was convened at the University of Shanghai, June 30-July 9, 1931. Fifty-one Chinese, thirty-eight Americans, and fourteen British, lived and worked together for ten days.[80] On the last day, quite spontaneously, the Religious Education Fellowship, with eighty-six charter members, was organized, with Frank W. Price as the first chairman.[81] It resulted from the breaking down of racial barriers at that Conference. On the last evening, the chairman, Dr. Lew, had stated that these ten days were a dream come true, a time when no single shadow had been cast between the unity of Chinese and their Christian friends from the West.[82] Another wrote afterwards:

> It was the first time in my experience that the Americans, Chinese, English . . . gathered together spending ten solid days without any slightest discrimination . . . or claiming special privileges or different treatments on the sole ground of difference in color.[83]

This Fellowship, begun so spontaneously, grew from eighty-six members in July, 1931, to six hundred and thirty-one by the end of 1934, and continued to maintain a steady membership of around 700 between 1934 and 1937. It is mentioned in Luther A. Weigle's résumé of the work of the NCCRE, a constituent body of the WSSA.

> Let me briefly mention another of the constituent units of the World's Sunday School Association which has been doing significant work of outstanding educational merit and of tremendous significance for the world-wide fellowship of the Christian Churches. It is the National Committee for Christian Religious Education in China. This body is constituted . . . as the co-operative agent of the Christian churches for service in Christian education. It provides a graded curriculum of religious education for children and young people. It is responsible for widespread and effective work in vacation church schools. It stimulates and provides materials for adult religious education and for parent education. It has fostered the growing movement for the betterment of rural life and the strengthening of rural churches in China. It provides materials for Christian religious education in the middle schools and has organized a Christian

> Teachers' Fellowship for members and faculties of these schools. It enlisted the churches and institutions in a comprehensive study of theological education in China and stimulated the organization of the China Association of Theological Seminaries. It has organized and is effectively promoting a national movement for the training of voluntary lay church workers. It publishes a *Religious Education Quarterly*. . . . It has for a number of years fostered a Religious Education Fellowship which has some 700 members. . . .[84]

And, most important of all, the movement from the beginning was under Chinese leadership. The first secretary for the Council on Religious Education was Dr. Miao, who became the executive secretary for the NCCRE of which Dr. Lew was the first chairman.

The summary made by Dr. Weigle compresses into a single paragraph the work of scores of missionaries and Chinese, who provided the material and ideas, and the work of hundreds (running into thousands) of Chinese who used the material and ideas provided. The Religious Education Movement, as it was thought of by the little group at the center, included such work as T. T. Lew's contributions to hymnology and liturgy,[85] Frank Price's contributions to the rural church, Chester Miao's leadership of the Lay Training Movement, as well as the more obvious type of religious-education material produced by Everett M. Stowe, Charles F. Johnannaber, Mabel R. Nowlin, Marie Adams, Alice Gregg, and others: progressive, evangelical, and based on actual field work and experiments.

Significance to the Church. It is not too much to say that more advance was made in church-consciousness in the 1930's in China than had been made in the whole century preceding 1930. It would hardly be descriptive to say that the prestige of the church was at a low ebb. The truth was, as T. C. Chao pointed out, that the church had "not yet become a church at all."

> The Church in China has not only fallen short of this conception (namely, that it is the Word Incarnate in society, representing in its own life the essentials of a good and satisfactory society . . .) but has not yet become a Church at all. One of the reasons . . . is the multitude of denominations imported into China. . . . In presenting some firewood . . . these denominations have not opened people's eyes to the forest, the greatness of the Church Universal and the importance, in that light, of the fellowship of the local group.[86]

There had arisen in the 1920's the Christian Movement.[87] This was in line with the New Civilization Movement, the Patriotic Movement, and so on. But, in the nineteen-thirties, when the law of the land drove religious education out of the school so that it had, perforce, to go to the church, the church as an institution came into its own. Pictures of beautiful altars appeared in the *Educational Review* for the first time in January, 1930. In the face of the scorn of their fellow countrymen for religion, as equated with superstition, the Chinese Christians delighted in the term *tsung chiao chiao yu* (religious education). This said in effect: You have driven religion from education: we will bring education into religion. So it came about that the set of circumstances which had made Christianity into a system of ethics in China rather than a religion was changed by the government, and religious education, driven from the school into the church, found its center, not in instruction, but in the great act of worship, the adequate preparation for which involved instruction.

Results of Registration: Missionary Role

Primary Field Closed. After 1927, any missionary who attempted to remain in the primary-school field did so in defiance of a very strong public opinion. An article by a Chinese in early 1928 expresses in words what was crystalized Chinese opinion at that time. Her argument is that after all these years of mission work there certainly should be Chinese capable of running primary education. Chinese have not been allowed to be responsible, she declared, but they are perfectly competent to run the primary schools and to keep them Christian.[88]

Almost no missionary contributed articles on primary-school education to the *Educational Review* during the ten years 1927-1937. One or two articles by Dr. Cressy and Dr. Main appeared but, for the most part, Dr. Main, editor of the *Review*, got her primary-school material from other sources: Nankai University, W. T. Tao, *et al.*[89]

Desired in Secondary Schools and Colleges. In the case of secondary schools and colleges, the sentiment ran strongly toward Westerners as teachers. Shortly after the capital was established at Nanking George Kin Leung wrote:

> While China is rapidly producing in ever-increasing numbers men of experience who can accept responsibility as heads of departments of medicine, science, or engineering in higher institutions of learning, there is still a pressing need for foreign assistance, especially missionaries of long experience in these subjects and desiring to give students the best to be had.[90]

The first issue of the *Educational Review* in 1928 carried three articles on the place of the missionary in the middle schools, all emphasizing the need for missionaries. The second half of Mr. Leung's article on missionary service in education was also in this issue. All four of these writers, two Chinese and two Westerners, laid particular emphasis upon the need of interpreters of Western civilization. Mr. Leung said:

> Paradoxical as it may seem, foreigners, including business interests also, must thank the missionary for imparting to young China what is best in occidental culture. . . . No power can alter China's firm belief that she must be met as an equal in the family of nations. Missionaries are among the few who are willing to spend the time and energy to help China realize her end, while indirectly they are helping their own countries by giving the Chinese an opportunity to see a congenial side of European life.[91]

Mrs. Chen, a Christian, emphasizes the "Christian brotherhood" aspect.

> To take away the missionaries from secondary schools, leaving only the Chinese as the interpreters of international relationships and teachers of Christian brotherhood, would be like trying to teach science without a laboratory.[92]

The Westerners not only expressed their satisfaction in being able to interpret Western civilization, to teach English, to coach athletics, to share Christian ideals with young minds surrounded by "materialism, rationalism, and atheism," [93] but also welcomed Chinese leadership in the schools. John S. Barr said:

> A Western teacher may know what he would like to offer to China, but surely a Chinese teacher is more likely to know what his country needs, and what is the right method of supplying the need. The Chinese leader knows the situation and the people. . . . If we cannot be close friends and loyal colleagues to a headmaster just because he is Chinese, then I think we ought not to be in China.[94]

The other Westerner, also, expressed "devout" satisfaction that circumstances had conspired to divorce the foreigner from administrative work.[95]

While these opinions were given early in 1928, satisfaction with the new regime continued. In 1931, Dr. Rawlinson reported that some six thousand missionaries were back at work in China, and that there was a strong tendency to engage in institutional rather than in evangelistic work.[96] The absence of articles critical of missionaries by Chinese,[97] and the testimony of Dr. Stuart, of the Factfinders' Report,[98] and of individual missionaries of this period, confirm the welcome accorded missionary teachers in the Christian schools under Chinese administration.

Desired in Religious Education. One of the first openings for missionaries in the new situation created by the nationalist revolution was in the field of religious education. The change from required chapel and classes to the voluntary basis made it imperative to plan a program of religious education that would attract. Also, as has been seen, the new Chinese principals were confronted with the necessity of raising fees which reduced the number of Christians in the student body just at the time when they were most needed. The Miao-Price survey, 1928-1929, found that very many of the missionaries who were on furlough, either regular, or advanced because of the evacuation, were taking courses in religious education "in the conviction that this was to be their special contribution to the schools during the coming years." [99] One of their findings read:

> There has been an increasing demand for specially trained teachers . . . to direct the whole program of religious education. The present tendency in many schools is that missionary teachers, who have transferred their administrative duties to Chinese leaders, should become religious work directors.[100]

This tendency was commended, but accompanied by a warning to the missionary not to repeat in religious education the mistake of an earlier generation with regard to general education, namely, the mistake of making one field a monopoly. Nothing in the subsequent history of these years justified the warning. In fact, the demand for missionaries to serve in this capacity was never met. In 1937, Dr. Stuart said the situation was a "challenge" to the sending boards.

> There are in the "sending countries" young men and women beautifully fitted for such service, with beliefs, experiences, and intentions of the sort that amply compensate for linguistic and other deficiencies arising from their foreign birth. They are more than ever welcomed by Chinese administrators and the whole constituency of these schools as supplying something that is consciously needed. If Chinese are ever to be found and fitted for leadership in religious education and provision made for them in budgets raised from local sources, the most natural and hopeful process will be the presence of . . . the right type of missionary teacher . . . in the schools throughout the length of this as yet formative period.[101]

The Secretary of the Student Division of the YMCA, also, listed as one of the contributory causes to the secularization of the Christian colleges the drop in the proportion of missionary teachers.[102]

CHAPTER XI

Summary

A CHANGED EDUCATIONAL ROLE

THE one hundred thirty years under review in this study fall into three periods: for ninety-five years (1807-1902) the Protestant educational missionary effort was the forerunner of China's national system of schools; for twenty-five years (1902-1927) there was a missionary system of schools which, for the major portion of this time, was the best in the land, but the national system was developing rapidly; during the last decade of this period (1927-1937) the majority of Protestant educational missionaries worked in Christian institutions administered by Chinese and registered under the Chinese government. In general, the relationships between the missionary teacher and his fellow teachers, his fellow Christians, the Chinese people, and the recognized government were never more satisfactory. Whatever the technicalities of the case might be—the despised treaties, for example, remained in force until January, 1943—the missionary felt himself welcome.[1] He knew that the supply of teachers sent out by the mission boards was not meeting the demand in

China for educators who had Western training. On the other hand, he accepted the Chinese point of view, namely, that while the Chinese increasingly appreciated the educational services of Western Christians, Westerners should also appreciate the fact that in being permitted to render such educational service they were enjoying a privilege accorded by a self-respecting government only to its best friends.[2] This situation differs so drastically from that prevailing in the last half of the nineteenth century that it could have come about only through fundamental changes in China's place in the world, in the role of Christianity in the world, and in the relation between Christianity and Western civilization. These changes were foreshadowed in 1909; they took clearer shape in the decade following; and they were consummated after 1927.

The major fields in which changed thought and behavior patterns are apparent are (1) Chinese civilization or culture, (2) the Chinese government, (3) race conceptions, and (4) Christianity, itself. No one of these aspects can be isolated from the other three, for all are strands of one common pattern. Yet for convenience in discussion, they will be considered seriatim.

MAJOR FIELDS OF CHANGE

Chinese Civilization. Patriotism in the modern sense came into being in China in the twentieth century, but pride of civilization has characterized the "sons of Han" for millenniums. The Jesuits who entered China in the late sixteenth century, under the Ming dynasty, found conditions which impressed them as far superior to the war-torn Europe they had left. Their reports led to a great respect for the Chinese Empire. But between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, major changes had occurred in the life of the nation. An alien dynasty had entered, and passed its zenith; furthermore, one of the great Emperors of this dynasty had carried out such an expurgation of literature—designed to remove all knowledge that might lead to a revolt against Manchu rule—that the intellectual basis for a revolt was removed, and the result was the "decadent civilization" of the late nineteenth century.[3]

It can always be a source of satisfaction to Chinese Protestant Christians that Robert Morrison, the pioneer Protestant missionary, entered China only twelve years after the Ch'ien Lung Emperor's sixty-year reign ended in 1795, before the aura of his glory had disappeared and before it was apparent that the peak of Manchu rule was passed. Evidence that Morrison respected Chinese civilization is to be found in his plan for the Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca as an institution where Europeans and Chinese might meet, each to study the language and civilization of the other. The plan was never realized, for it became increasingly apparent that Chinese prestige was on the wane; nor was it revived by the missionaries who entered China in the wake of the two Opium wars, with all their attendant propaganda.

Following these developments there were always in the missionary body those who felt the secondary purpose of their presence in China to be the replacing of the prevalent "heathen" civilization with "Christian" civilization. A few typical examples will suffice. The Rev. E. Z. Simmons addressed the Canton Missionary Association in 1885 as follows:

> Our relation to the Chinese is that of a civilized, Christianized, and progressive people to a semicivilized, heathen, and retrogressive people. . . . We are here to supplant this semicivilization. And the worst of the whole business is that they do not, and seem determined not to, recognize the fact.[4]

Again, in 1894, Dr. Henry Blodgett addressed a graduating class at Peking University in these words (which indicate that the ten years had brought changes):

> The present opportunity is one of the rising tide in China of Christian propagandism and of the spread of that civilization which has grown up with Christianity.[5]

The two outstanding missionary journalists whose fame remains in China today, Young J. Allen and Timothy Richard, labored indefatigably for the spread of Western civilization. The handicaps under which nineteenth-century missionaries worked were set forward by Timothy Richard in an article written in 1903. Ideally, he explained, missionaries should, first of all, have studied the Chinese civilization and language in order to make a proper diagnosis of "China's disease." [6] This done, the leaders of the people should have been approached with "Christian truth." Unfortunately, however, this course was not possible.

> Not having free access to the leaders—whether mandarins, gentry, leading Buddhists, leading Taoists, or leading Mohammedans—the missionaries opened chapels in the main streets, in the hope of catching the attention of some passers-by. But anti-Christian leagues were formed to fine and boycott all who entered a Christian chapel. The consequence was that only strangers and men who had no reputation to lose came at first to the chapels and churches.[7]

The main theme at the Fourth Triennial of the Educational Association of China (1902) was the "proud intolerance" and the "lack of humility" of the Chinese ruling class who would not recognize the superiority of Western civilization. Their conceit and pride and intolerance made it essential for the missionaries to set up their own system of schools. In consequence, the "Appeal to the Foreign Mission Boards for Trained Educators for China" was drafted. (See Appendix B.)

The record of the next seven years shows that the trend was steadily toward the acceptance of Western civilization.

As the cracks in Confucian civilization began to appear, some missionaries grew alarmed. Dr. Bowen suggests that it may be a function of the mission school to lead the Chinese back "to their own rich and varied learning," [8] which, he asserts, they are abandoning with too much rapidity.

> There is a deplorable tendency on the part of the new China to neglect Chinese learning and philosophy. . . . We are beginning to see a generation springing up without manners and with smatterings of knowledge. The old Confucian scholar was a gentleman in many of the finer qualities we all admire.[9]

Dr. Pott, in 1915, also based his plea for better Chinese departments on the fact that China was changing too rapidly for her own good and needed to conserve much of her old civilization. Several years earlier, D. L. Anderson had pointed out that there were treasures in Chinese civilization for the world and that for this reason the Chinese department in a college was of prime importance.

But not all of the change in China was due to the acceptance of Western civilization. Under its impact Chinese scholars—freed from the Manchu yoke—were delving into the so-called unorthodox philosophers. In the same issue in which Dr. Bowen deplores the neglect of Chinese studies, the Right Reverend Logan H. Roots, D.D., bishop of the diocese of Hankow, was prophesying changes in China which would "change the face of the earth." He said:

> The prevalence of a desiccated and decadent Confucianism . . . has tended to obscure the writings of the so-called unorthodox philosophers, but the younger generation of scholars is bringing this mine of fertile reflection on the problems of the universe to light. . . . Just now all signs indicate that there is about to take place in China a Renaissance which will change the face of the earth.[10]

This Renaissance began in 1915, the year after the beginning of World War I. The lights began to come on in Asia just as they were going out in Europe.

Pride in civilization revived—this time on a sound basis. Chinese Christians began to grow restive under missionary rule. It was not fitting, they said on more than one occasion, that the missionary be the "host" in institutions in China, and Chinese the guests, or, that the missionary be the employer of Chinese employees. From the Sixth Triennial in 1909 onward until fundamental changes were made in 1927, missionaries were under pressure from Chinese Christians who were asking a share in the determining of educational content and policy, and were gradually realizing that their Chinese colleagues should have a share. After 1919, there came outside pressure and Chinese nationalists made much of the fact that mission schools were denationalizing agencies. The chief features which ran against the Chinese grain in these schools were the poor quality of Chinese language teaching and the compulsory religious teaching, both of which issues were settled by registration under Chinese government auspices.[11]

Victory came to the Chinese in 1927—not complete victory, but a large measure of it. Many missionaries agreed with them that their civilization was their own and left China in 1927, never to return. (See Appendix A.) Many others agreed with them and found happiness in working under the new conditions. More and more the ideal of the missionary came to be that of serving as a resource rather than as a controlling force. In great measure the principle enunciated by Dr. Cheng Ching-yi in 1922 prevailed: "Chinese Christian Independence and Western Christian Co-operation." [12]

Among the outstanding evidences of respect for Chinese civilization was the Harvard-Yenching Institute of Chinese Studies for research into Chinese literature, history, philosophy, religion, and art, established in 1928. The trustees were to seek a budget of two million United States dollars.[13]

The Chinese Government. Relationship between the Manchus and the missionaries was marked by mutual antagonism and distrust; relationship between the Kuomintang government and the missionaries was that of mutual cooperation. Here, the changed attitudes and practices were due far more to the change in the character of the government than to any other cause. A missionary looked back in 1918 and described his status under the Manchu regime:

> Trying by all means in his power to find some point of contact; hated, suspected, ostracized; accused of murdering children, detested as worse than the offscouring of the earth. But he persevered and succeeded in securing a foothold. He translated books, established churches, schools, hospitals, printing presses, and persuaded many to believe the eternal truths of the gospel.[14]

Many missionaries suffered martyrdom under the Manchus, not because of their religion, but because they were the only Westerners upon whom a weak government could wreak vengeance for the encroachments of Western nations.[15] Also, because of their treaty status they were taken for spies and government agents. They were in the uncomfortable position of guests of an unwilling host.

> We assume that we have a right to be here, and we have according to treaty. But it should be remembered that these treaties were forced upon China. The Chinese show how they regard them by the way in which they do not carry them out.[16]

The only brief interval in the nineteenth century when missionaries were *personæ gratæ* to the government came during the Reform era, when the Kuang Hsü Emperor was on the Throne. After 1900, forced to outward loyalty, they found their position most difficult. A Chinese student in America reproved them as follows:

> The real trouble is that most of you, I do not say all of you, say that Chinese ought to love our country (you never say, to serve it), but when we . . . try to realize our patriotic consciousness and express it in our speeches and actions, at once you want to stop and turn us back absolutely to indifference. . . . I think this alone is a sufficient reason for the enemies of Christianity to attack the missionaries and the Christians at large and regard them as unpatriotic and traitors to China.[17]

Despite official resentment, however, the good mission schools were crowded with the sons and daughters of gentry and officials, eager for a knowledge of English which would open the door to Western universities. Mission schools grew in number and influence until 1924, when the Anti-Christian Movement, capitalizing on the upsurge of nationalism, attempted to wreck the Christian schools.

Under attack, the educational missionaries were the first to call for a "thorough inquiry into the whole subject of the treaties." No defense of the treaty status was ever made in the *Educational Review* when that subject again came to the fore in 1923 and subsequently. On the contrary, educational leaders recognized the "privileges" as a handicap, and the editorial columns warned against appealing to treaty protection, which would be conclusive evidence to the Chinese that the schools were, indeed, stealing the hearts of the students for a foreign government. And, finally, when the Kuomintang set up its capital at Nanking, long before it was certainly established in the eyes of the world that it could maintain itself, the leadership of the China Christian Educational Association called for loyalty to the struggling regime. Local conditions varied, but the Central Educational Commission at Nanking was a court of appeal.

The principal issue between the Christian schools and the government in the 1930's was over the matter of the exclusion of all religious education from elementary and junior middle schools.[18] This was a severe blow, but it was accepted as the law of the land. Such crisis as was precipitated was within the Christian community—Chinese and foreign—and the issue was: Shall the schools, under these circumstances, remain open? It is significant of the changed times that the question was submitted, not to a group of leading missionaries, but to the new Chinese college presidents, deans, and some Chinese prominent in the church. Their opinion was overwhelmingly in favor of the continuance of the Christian schools under whatever conditions. In general, missionaries took pride in the registered status of the school with which they were connected, even though it meant an overcrowded curriculum, which they deplored.

To a very great degree the aims of the Chinese government, 1927-1937, coincided with Christian aims. Whatever is alleged against churches in the West, the churches in China were social-revolutionary agencies, as their joy in the Reform Movement of 1895 shows. In this period, when rural reconstruction was the prime concern of the government, it found useful allies in the churches and educational institutions, especially the Christian universities. The rural church was in the forefront of Christian thinking. Many middle schools undertook to train for rural work. University after university announced either a rural department, or an extension of its rural work. Cheeloo was outstanding in this, but was not alone. In one year, the University of Nanking, for example, received a quarter of a million dollars in connection with various government projects. Among the items listed was a first payment of $100,000 from the Farmers' Bank of Anhui, Kiangsi, Hupeh, and Hunan (founded by Chiang Kai-shek) in connection with a survey, to be undertaken by the College of Agriculture and Forestry, of marketing conditions, landlord-tenant relationships, and soil productivity in those four provinces.[19]

Race Conceptions. The problem of race was complicated, of course, by political and economic factors. China was a defeated nation when the treaty ports were opened in 1842; it was a twice-defeated nation when missionaries entered the interior in 1860. As we have seen, the animosity of the Manchus toward the missionaries prevented any intercourse with the higher classes. Early converts were from the lower economic level and—true to the saving power of the gospel—a few even from the criminal or near-criminal class. "Men with no reputation to lose" might come in to hear what the missionary had to say and to investigate possibilities of taking service in what was supposed to be espionage openly and flagrantly conducted. Under such handicaps, the early missionaries worked. It is not surprising, therefore, that patterns of behavior between missionaries and early Christians were those of superior to inferior, of employer to employed.

If relationships between missionaries and Chinese were bad—as they undoubtedly were[20]—relationships between other Westerners in China and the Chinese were infinitely worse.[21] Mr. Tong Kai-son hints at this when he says that often missionaries in the treaty ports were influenced by the racial arrogance of their fellow-countrymen and began to treat Chinese as though they were an inferior race. Nevertheless, while missionaries were never, or seldom, guilty of booting and caning helpless coolies, and were not responsible for laws which prevented Chinese from entering municipal parks in treaty ports, or traveling first class in Yangtse steamers, and the like, there are alive today the children of early Christians who remember that their parents, in some cases ordained clergy, might approach the missionary only through his back door.[22]

Along with the other changes in 1909, personal relationships, also, began to change. Bishop Roots pointed out at this time that it was a great mistake to think of the Chinese as a "decadent race," because, "given equal opportunity, he can hold his own with the best men of other races." [23] A very great improvement in relationships between missionaries and Chinese had come about before the success of the Nationalist Revolution of 1927 brought an end to grosser race distinctions in the treaty ports. Not only were changed attitudes in the Chinese producing changed attitudes in the missionaries, but new missionaries with different racial attitudes were now coming to China. Many of them had studied in colleges with Chinese classmates. The junior missionaries, whose democratic attitudes Dr. Stuart had commended in 1919, were the middlers of 1931, and it was largely from this group that delegates were selected for the All-China Religious Education Conference which brought great satisfaction to all as a demonstration of Christian fraternity.

Christianity. The nineteenth-century idea of a Christian West and a non-Christian East has given place to the idea of a Christian world community, or a world church, existing in the midst of a secular society. The conception of world Christianity was greatly aided by World War I. At the same time that the Chinese were being amazed at the spectacle of Westerners, who hitherto had presented a united front in the East, now engaged in fratricidal war, with German possessions in Shantung taken over by Japan and Germans interned in China, many missionaries, who had not followed John R. Mott in his peregrinations over the globe and had not shared his vision of a World Student Christian Federation, but lingered in the spirit of the nineteenth century, had a rude awakening. D. E. Hoste, Superintendent of the China Inland Mission, wrote of the shock and dismay in Christian circles.

> That the war has occasioned no little modification and even upset of previous ideas concerning the place and

> influence of Christianity in modern Christendom, is true. . . The question forces itself upon us, where, if anywhere on earth, is a true corporate Christian society to be found? Has our view of the moral and religious condition of the Western nations been lacking in depth and penetration, with the result that we have given the sacred name of "Christian" to communities not entitled to it? . . . If the war teaches us afresh the cardinal distinction between the Church of God and the world, one important benefit, at all events, will have resulted from it.[24]

After this shattering of old geographical conceptions of "Christendom" and "heathendom" there could grow up the new idea of the world church, a supraracial, supranational "community of grace" within a secular society. In such a society, all are equals. It was no longer possible for a missionary to define the status of Westerner and Chinese as that of superior and inferior simply on the ground that the missionary had "all Christendom" behind him. (See Dr. Bergen, address at the Fifth Triennial, 1905.) Any Christian might have "all Christendom" behind him.

The finest fruit of this new relationship between Chinese and Western Christians was the volume, *Hymns of Universal Praise (P'u T'ien Sung Tsan)*, published in 1936. Such a volume of poetry and music, judged by both Eastern and Western canons of art, represented a real synthesis of East and West. It could not have been produced before the Renaissance Movement had made possible the literary revolution. Nor could it have been produced by Robert F. Fitch, Louise Strong Hammond, Bliss Wiant, and other Westerners working with Chinese "assistants." Nor could it have resulted from the labors of T. T. Lew, Ernest Y. L. Yang, T. C. Chao, and other Chinese working alone. Rather, it was the product of Westerners who knew both Western music and Christian tradition, and of Chinese who combined an appreciation of their own musical heritage and literary tradition with a full appreciation of the necessity of transmitting Western Christian thought into an acceptable Chinese literary form within the limitations of the given Western tunes. Such a hymn as "Lead, Kindly Light," rendering Western theological thought into acceptable Chinese literary form and combining this with the familiar tune of the ecumenical church, is an example. It is tangible evidence that Christianity has taken root in Chinese culture, and enriches the hymnology of the world.

IN CONCLUSION

The present tendencies are all toward Chinese Christian independence and Western Christian co-operation. J. M. Tan, addressing the Amsterdam Youth Conference in 1938, says:

> The terms "Christian" and "non-Christian" countries are out of date; the terms "home churches" and "foreign missions" belong to an earlier understanding of geography; . . . The fact is that the one Church of Christ is living in the world and calls us into its membership and service in every land. . . . Every church is a missionary church. . . .According to a Chinese proverb, this is a time . . . for pooling our resources: those who have money, contribute money; those who have strength, contribute strength. Different contributions go to the same goal—the realization of a world Christian community.[25]

The Christian Church in China is striving to be true to the tenets of the ecumenical church, and at the same time to the nature and circumstances of the Chinese people, and to meet the manifold needs and opportunities of the times. To do these things, they need the help and sympathy of the whole Christian Church which can be manifested in both funds and personnel.

Christian personnel from the Western churches is earnestly desired by Chinese administrators in church, hospital, or school. The Fact Finders sent out by the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry found this very generally true. They were puzzled, however, by the two characteristics upon which the Chinese laid stress: "technical competency" and "adaptability to new circumstances." They wrote:

> The Chinese are putting new stress on better qualified missionaries, and particularly, upon adaptability to new circumstances. . . . Undoubtedly, missionaries in the past have chosen able and pious Chinese for their associates, but beyond all question they have also chosen tractable Chinese whom they could dominate without too great difficulty. The staff cannot avoid the suspicion that the tables are now turned, and that the missionaries who are now being chosen for survival are not always the most forceful and vigorous. This is what the demand for "adaptable" missionaries often amounts to; it would not be a human situation otherwise.[26]

This conclusion might be true if the tables were, in reality, turned; if, for example, a Chinese principal might use Dr. Bergen's words in reverse, saying: "In short, through the money power he has his Western staff completely under his control . . ." This, of course, is not the situation. The Chinese college president welcomes a professor of music or English or chemistry sent out at the instance of Western Christians to work in a Christian institution in China. He values such a gift of personnel—not in terms of "tractability" to his personal views along any line, but—in terms of the technical competency of the professor in his subject, and in his ability to make a successful adjustment to Chinese college life. Finally, he sets the highest value on the Western teacher in a Christian institution who is technically competent in his subject, who adjusts to Chinese society, and who also, through the power of a winsome personality, attracts young people to the Christian life.

CHAPTER XII

China—A Forecast

CHINA—A FORECAST

THAT China is destined to take a leading role in the creation of the world civilization of the future is beyond question. Its favorable geographical situation, the quality of Chinese civilization, and the character of the Chinese people, all assure it. Westerners, with their limited knowledge of the East, and their even more limited experience with history, may raise their eyebrows, and wonder what there has been in China's history in the last century to justify such optimism. The answer is, much—even in the last one hundred years—for those who know.

The Chinese, on the other hand, have always expected to take a leading role. Possessed for centuries of a mellow philosophy which sees in disaster the seeds of triumph, and in triumph, seeds of possible disaster, the Chinese never doubted that the wheel which started downward in the nineteenth century would, in due course, round the curve and start upward again. Looking back, the turn for the better began with the twentieth century. The island of Hongkong was ceded to Great Britain in perpetuity in the first Sino-British

Treaty, October 8, 1842, and before 1900, numerous "concessions" had been leased to other Western powers for ninety-nine years. Never, however, since 1900, has any Western power infringed on China's territorial integrity; such infringement has been left to Japan. On the contrary, beginning with Germany in 1914, and followed by Russia in 1918, European powers have been losing their "spheres of influence," and their privileges of extraterritoriality, bit by bit, until the final abrogation of the unequal treaties was declared by both London and Washington on January 15, 1943, just one century, three months, and one week, after the Treaty of Nanking was signed. That this state of affairs has been brought about is a triumph for Chinese diplomacy and the united sentiment of the Chinese people.

But territorial aggression is not the only kind of aggression. The immediate struggle which faces China now that it is, theoretically, an equal in the family of nations, is the maintenance of financial integrity. With a long coastline, excellent ports, undeveloped mineral resources, China can look forward with confidence to the eventual position of real equality in power and strength. Meantime, as Dr. Sun Fo (the son of the famous Father of his country, Sun Yat-sen) has pointed out, the problem of getting capital in the immediate future for the rehabilitation of a wasted country, and the development of industrial strength, will not be easy. Foreign firms, no longer able to conduct business under the laws of their own countries which would guarantee good profits to investors, will not be willing to submit to the economic system which China is planning. The solution, he says, must be found in agrarian reforms which will enable China to carry out its planned industrial program with the minimum of capital which the government may be able to borrow.[1] Although the struggle ahead is going to be hard, there is no reason to despair. The people who have checked territorial aggression and who have endured eight long years of blockade and war will also be able to check economic aggression. There will be no financial imperialism in China.

But what is of most concern to the outside world is, naturally, not whether China can take care of itself, but what China will do to the rest of the world. Will China become a Fascist state, or a Communist state, or a Democratic state? It is proverbial that politics makes strange bedfellows, but it has never made stranger ones than when Western business interests and Chinese Communists join hands in opposing the Chiang Kai-shek regime as illiberal to business. On the other hand, the die-hard capitalists who are Russophobes would like to uphold the Kuomintang if it is opposed to Russia, and American Leftists are ardently pro-Communist, labeling the Chinese Communists "Democrats," and the Kuomintang, "Fascist."

That there have been Fascist tendencies of late years is evident. The original unifier of China, the tyrant, Ch'in Shih Hwang-ti, execrated for more than two millenniums in the traditions and folk songs of the people, became suddenly China's great benefactor. Without him, China would never have been unified, even as Europe has never been unified. But at no time in China's long history has Fascism endured for long. As the mystic, Laotzu, wrote:

> Those who would take over the earth
> And shape it to their will,
> Never, I notice, succeed.

After some two millenniums of Laoist and Confucianist tradition concerning the worth of man, and his duty to rebel against a sovereign who oppressed, it is hardly likely that totalitarianism would succeed in China.

The truth is that China has a far more inclusive pattern of democracy laid out for itself than either Russia or the United States. Russia claims democracy in two spheres: on the international plane and economically. The United States identifies democracy with going to the polls. The Three Principles of Sun Yat-sen deal with democracy in the Russian sense in Principles One and Three, and with democracy in the American or Western sense, in Principle Two. The Communists have been fighting mainly for Principle Three while the Kuomintang has been moving *seriatim* in its emphases. Given peace, and anything approaching a square deal, China will build firmly on the Three Principles.

Finally, what of Christianity, and of the private Christian schools under the new conditions?

The fate of Chinese Christians will be affected by what Western Christians do. If the Church in the West is on the side of those who would indulge in financial imperialism; who would uphold racial barriers; who would attempt to endow chairs in colleges before the educational authorities have seen the need for such chairs—the cry of "cultural imperialism" will be raised. But if the Christians of the West attempt to meet felt needs, there is nothing to fear. Few Christian institutions have any adjustment to make because of the abolition of extraterritoriality. China achieved her goal of educational autonomy in most instances in 1927. There will, however, be the continuing problem of the promotion of the religious life in these institutions. Here, the World Student Christian Federation has a great role to play. The exchange of students can be aided. Young graduates might be sent out for a year of English teaching, as a free gift to a sister institution in China—a gift which would bring rich returns in world-mindedness to the sending universities. Oberlin and Yale are already known for doing this, and they are rendering a tremendous service in the spread of the Christian Fellowship. One or two years spent by a young American student among Chinese students is apt to have life-long results. Far stronger bonds of friendship can be formed by youth than by more mature adults, and in shorter time. The young Chinese might enter the Beloved Community through the influence of the young Westerner, and would prove a steadying influence throughout life to his Western friend. Furthermore, the young Westerner would discover himself in the land where a real world civilization is in the making. He would discover that the treasures of Western civilization have been safely transplanted and are being woven into a new pattern of Chinese life.

In the nineteenth century, all the European nations moved in upon China, and China became acutely and painfully aware of the world. Her students have gone out to these lands—Russia, France, Great Britain, Italy, Germany, the United States—and have returned with an inside knowledge of these countries such as only students can get. They are world citizens in the true sense of that word, understanding Russian, French, British, or American problems from the Russian, French, British, or American point of view. What practical politician in any of these Western lands could write as understandingly of the others as Sun Fo has done? The gift of world-mindedness has come to China in repayment for the humiliations of the nineteenth century "spheres of influence."

APPENDIX A

Missionary Statistics

Taken from *1936 Handbook of the Christian Movement in China,* under Protestant Auspices, by Charles Luther Boynton and Charles Dozier Boynton, pp. viii-ix. ("*All totals are incomplete.*" p. x.)

Year	*Societies*	*Missionaries*	*Communicants*
1807	1	1	
1840	4	20	100
1853	15	120	351
1858	20	81 (men)	
1864	24	189	
1869			5,753
1874		436	
1876	29	473	13,035
1881		618	
1886			28,506
1887			32,260
1888			34,555
1889	41	1,296	37,287
1893	44	1,324	55,093
1898			80,682

Year	*Societies*	*Missionaries*	*Communicants*
1900			95,943
			112,808
1904			131,808
1905			178,251
1906	82	3,833	
1908-9	84	4,299	195,905
1909-10	86	4,628	177,942
1910		5,144	167,075
1911		5,171	207,747
1912-13		5,394	245,959
1913		5,563	
1914	107	5,978	253,210
1915		5,338	268,652
1916		5,740	293,139
1917		5,900	312,970
1918		6,395	
1919		6,636	345,853
1920		6,204	366,527
1922		7,663	402,539
1925		8,158	
1926		8,325	
1927		8,250	
1928		4,375	446,631
1929		4,744	
1930		6,346	
1933		5,775	488,539
1934		5,833	
1935		5,875	512,873
1936		6,059	

APPENDIX B

Appeal to Foreign Mission Boards for Trained Educators for China

From a survey of mission work in the Empire of China several prominent features become evident. One of the most important of these is that China has a traditional and profound regard for learning. This universal esteem for literature supplies an admirable basis upon which to erect the edifice of a more modern and rational system of education. Acting upon the broad and accepted dictum that education is the most powerful subsidiary agency in evangelism, and being greatly aided by the Chinese love of letters, the missionaries in China have, from the beginning, sought to encourage Christian education among the people. This work has gradually grown until the schools of all grades are now numbered by hundreds; boarding schools and colleges alone numbering over one hundred, with an attendance of some five thousand students, while seventy-five government schools, modelled on Western lines, hold some 5000 more. It will at once be seen what a powerful hold is here possessed for the advancement of Christianity. One important fact is that nearly all this educational influence is in the hands of

Christian men and women, and a further point of special interest is that the Educational Association of China thoroughly represents this work. This Association has a membership, scattered over twelve of the eighteen provinces, of about 250 men and women. At its last triennial session in Shanghai this year (May, 1902) there were about 130 members present. The meeting was a most enthusiastic one; the papers and discussions, covering a wide range of educational problems, were of a high order. Various committees were appointed to take action looking toward the solution of several questions that were discussed at the meeting. Among other things, the triennial meeting instructed the Executive Committee to make an appeal to the various mission boards and societies interested in mission work in China, urging them to send out specially trained men and women for school work in China.

The Association was organized in 1890. Much valuable work in the way of the preparation and publication of schoolbooks and textbooks had already been done by a committee of missionary educators known as the "School and Textbook Series Committee," which was organized in 1877. The book sales for the Association during the last triennium amounted to Mexican $13,630, nearly equalling the total of the previous twenty-two years, and the stock of books on hand at the end of December, 1901, was valued at Mexican $13,336. Nearly all of the fifty-odd missionary societies now operating in China are represented in this Association—English, Americans, and Germans belong to it. Its members are scattered all over the Empire, and are carrying on the work of education in primary schools, colleges, seminaries, etc. Thus, it will be seen that this is a national organization, and fully represents the Protestant educational interests of China.

It is this Association which, as intimated above, through their Executive Committee, now makes a most earnest appeal to the various Mission Boards of Europe and America to make a change in their policy of sending missionaries to this field. Hitherto it has been the policy of foreign missionary boards, generally, to send only ordained men to the mission field, as it was apparently considered that the principal, if not the only, work of a missionary was preaching. Whatever may have been said for this policy in the past, conditions, at least in China, have now greatly changed, and with the coming of new conditions new policies are needed. We would urge therefore that in the future, in selecting and sending out workers, special attention shall be given to securing those persons who, while otherwise qualified, have had special training to prepare them for educational work in the field. Most of the work in the colleges is now being done by those who have had no pedagogical training. But with the increased emphasis now being placed upon education, and with the ever widening opportunities for training and controlling the young mind of China, it has become necessary that specialists shall be sent out to take hold of this work and develop it in the most effective manner. In other words, the pioneering educational work, so well and faithfully done up to the present time, now requires a wider, more liberal, and specialized service than has hitherto been possible. Normal schools are now being called for in order to train teachers for educational work. Primary education in China needs at this time a few trained specialists in order to lay a foundation and raise up models for imitation by the Chinese. And we would call special attention to the need that is widely felt for the development of kindergarten and industrial schools. The modern educational system of China is now practically in the control of Christians who are representatives of the various missionary societies. This brings practically under the control of the Christian church one-fourth of the youth of the whole human family. By perfecting and strengthening this arm of the service, we increase the probability that the future governmental educational system of China will be largely influenced and moulded by such superior examples. Since such momentous issues are involved, and since such profound possibilities appear, the Educational Association of China do most earnestly hope that their request for reinforcements, consisting of trained educators for the various grades of educational work, will receive the prayerful and careful consideration of all foreign missionary societies. Definite requests for workers, both as to number and their location, will be considered and determined by each Board or Society from information received from its own representatives on the field.

As there is a tendency at present manifest on the part of the Chinese government to refuse the assistance of missionaries in the government schools, and to make regulations requiring the worship of Confucius, so that Christian students cannot enter these institutions, it becomes a question of the most vital importance how to man and equip our Christian schools with the very best possible outfit of men and means, so as adequately to meet the peculiar conditions in which we are now placed. China, as a field for Christian educational work, is unique. A Christian government took hold of the educational system of India. A non-Christian, though liberal, government took hold of the educational system in Japan. The results in both nations have been far-reaching and gratifying to all well-wishers of the race. In China a conservative, non-Christian government, while professedly seeking to remodel its educational system according to Western methods, by its policy of intolerance is deliberately trying to prevent the youth of the land from acquiring that strength and development of character which come only through a Christian education. All the more need there is, then, that Christian schools be manned and equipped in the very best possible way. Let us therefore have trained specialists, laymen by preference, to come to this field to develop the educational work and thus take and hold our rightful position as educators and guides of the young mind of this great nation.

Rev. A. P. Parker, D.D.
Rev. W. M. Hayes, D.D.
Dr. C. M. L. Sites
Rev. W. P. Bentley, M.A.
Rev. W. N. Bitton
Miss H. L. Richardson
Prof. E. R. Lyman
Rev. J. A. Silsby

The Executive Committee
(On behalf of the Educational Association of China)

(Quoted from the Educational Department, *Chinese Recorder*, December, 1902.

Replies from the American Boards, Educational Department, *Chinese Recorder*, November, 1903, and from the British, in March, 1904.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(A select list of the works found most useful in the preparation of this book.)

Primary Sources

(Chronologically arranged)

The Chinese Repository. Volumes I-XX, May 1832-December 1851. Canton. Editors: (1) Elijah Coleman Bridgman (2) Samuel Wells Williams.

MEDHURST, WALTER HENRY. *China, Its State and Prospects.* London: 1838.

MORRISON, ELIZA A. *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, D.D.* London: 1839.

JETER, J. B. *A Memoir of Mrs. Henrietta Shuck, The First American Female Missionary to China.* Boston: 1849.

The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal. Foochow: 1868-72. Shanghai: 1874-1941. Beginning in February, 1912, the name was shortened to *The Chinese Recorder.* The last issue, prior to World War II, to reach the United States is that of November, 1941.

Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China, Shanghai, May 10-24, 1877. Shanghai: 1878.

Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China, Shanghai, May 7-20, 1890. Shanghai: 1890.

China Centenary Missionary Conference Records, Report of the Great Conference held at Shanghai, April 5th to May 8th, 1907. New York: 1907.

A Century of Protestant Missions in China (1807-1907). Being the Centenary Conference Historical Volume. Edited by D. Macgillivray. Shanghai: 1907.

Records of the Second Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China, Shanghai, May 6-9, 1896. Shanghai: 1896.

Records of the Third Triennial Meeting etc., May 17-20, 1899. Shanghai: 1900.

Records of the Fourth Triennial Meeting etc., May 21-24, 1902. Shanghai: 1902.

Records of the Fifth Triennial Meeting etc., May 17-20, 1905. Shanghai: 1906.

Records of the Sixth Triennial Meeting etc., May 19-22, 1909. Shanghai: 1909.

Monthly Bulletin of the Educational Association of China. Numbers 1-17, May 1907-Nov.-Dec. 1908. Shanghai: 1907-8.

The Educational Review. Volumes II-IV, 1909-11. Shanghai: 1909-11. Monthly.

The Educational Review. Volumes VI-XXIX, December 1913-November 1937. Shanghai: 1913-37. Quarterly. Merged with *The Chinese Recorder* in 1938.

The China Mission Year Book. Donald MacGillivray, editor, 1910-15; China Continuation Committee, 1916-19; National Christian Council, 1923-25. Shanghai.

The China Christian Year Book. (Continuation of above.) Frank Rawlinson, editor, 1926-37; T. T. Lew, editor-in-chief, 1938-39. Shanghai.

Statistical Atlas for Christian Missions. Edinburgh: 1910.

World Missionary Atlas. New York: Student Volunteer Movement. 1911.

Christian Education in China. Committee of Reference and Counsel, Foreign Missions Conference of North America, Inc. New York: 1922. A study made by an Educational Commission representing the Mission Boards and Societies conducting work in China.

The Christian Occupation of China. Milton T. Stauffer, Secretary and editor. Assisted by M. Gardner Tewksbury and Tsinfong C. Wang. Shanghai: 1922. A general survey of the numerical strength and geographical distribution of the Christian forces in China, made by the Special Committee on Survey and Occupation. China Continuation Committee, 1918-21.

Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24-April 8, 1928. Volumes I-VIII. New York: 1928.

SHU HSIN-CH'ENG. Chin Tai Chung Kuo Chiao Yü Shih Liao. (A Collection of Documents on the History of Education in China.) Shanghai: 1928.

MIAO, CHESTER S. and PRICE, FRANK W. *Religion and Character in Christian Middle Schools.* Shanghai: 1929.

Religious Education in the Chinese Church. The Report of a Deputation, 1931. Shanghai: 1931.

Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry. New York: 1933. Fact Finders' Reports, China, Volume V.

Hymns of Universal Praise (P'u T'ien Sung Tsan.) Shanghai: 1936.

The Madras Series. Volumes I-VIII. New York: 1939.

Secondary Sources

BAKER, ARCHIBALD G. *Christian Missions and a New World Culture.* Chicago: 1934.

BERESFORD, LORD CHARLES. *The Break-up of China.* New York and London: 1899.

BRITTON, ROSWELL S. *The Chinese Periodical Press, 1800-1912.* Shanghai: 1933.

CHANG CHIH-TUNG, see WOODBRIDGE.

MILTON STAUFFER, editor, *China Her Own Interpreter*. Student Volunteer Movement. New York: 1927.

China To-day Through Chinese Eyes, First Series. London: 1922.

China To-day Through Chinese Eyes, Second Series. London: 1926.

The Presentation of Christianity in Confucian Lands. Board of Missionary Preparation. New York: 1917.

CHU YOU-KWANG. *Some Problems of a National System of Education in China*. Shanghai: 1933.

CUBBERLY, ELLWOOD P. *A Brief History of Education*. Boston: 1922.

DANTON, GEORGE H. *The Culture Contacts of the United States and China, The Earliest Sino-American Culture Contacts 1784-1844*. New York: 1931.

FORD, LUCIUS EDDY. *The History of the Educational Work of the Methodist Episcopal Church in China*. Foochow: 1938.

GOODRICH, L. CARRINGTON. *The Literary Inquisition of Ch'ien Lung*. Baltimore: 1935.

——— *A Short History of the Chinese People*. New York: 1943.

GRAYBILL, HENRY BLAIR. *The Educational Reform in China*. Hongkong: 1911.

HART, SIR ROBERT. *These from the Land of Sinim*. London: 1901.

HU SHIH. See *Independence, Converging, and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought, and Art*. Also, ZEN.

HUNTINGTON, VIRGINIA E. *Along the Great River*. New York: 1940.

Independence, Converging, and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought, and Art. Harvard Tercentenary. Cambridge: 1937. Hu Shih, The Indianization of China, pp. 219-47.

KEYTE, J. C. *In China Now*. London: 1923.

KUO PING WEN. *The Chinese System of Public Education*. New York: 1915.

La Fargue, Thomas Edward. *China's First Hundred.* Pullman, State College of Washington: 1942.

Lane, Ortha M. *Missions in Magazines.* Tientsin: 1935.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christian Missions in China.* New York: 1929.

——— *History of the Expansion of Christianity, Volume VI, The Great Century in Northern Africa and Asia.* New York: 1944.

The Reorganization of Education in China. League of Nations' Mission of Educational Experts. Paris: 1932.

Mason, Mary Gertrude. *Western Concepts of China and the Chinese, 1840-1876.* New York: 1939.

Monroe, Paul. *Essays in Comparative Education.* New York: 1927. Republished papers.

Morse, H. B. and MacNair, Harley Farnsworth. *Far Eastern International Relations.* Boston: 1931.

Peake, Cyrus H. *Nationalism and Education in Modern China.* New York: 1932.

Dagobert D. Runes, editor, *Dictionary of Philosophy.* New York: 1942.

Pieters, Albertus. *The Educational System of Japan.* Nagasaki: 1906. Prepared from official sources.

Rees, Ronald D. *China Faces the Storm.* London: 1937.

Snow, Edgar. *Red Star Over China.* New York: 1938.

Steiger, George Nye. *China and the Occident, The Origin and Development of the Boxer Movement.* New Haven: 1927.

Tsui Chi. *A Short History of Chinese Civilization.* London: 1942. Introduction by Laurence Binyon.

Webster, James B. *Christian Education and the National Consciousness in China.* New York: 1923.

Woodbridge, Samuel I. *China's Only Hope, An Appeal by her Greatest Viceroy, Chang Chih-tung, with the Sanction of the Present Emperor, Kwang Hsü.* New York: 1900. Also called *An Exhortation to Learning.*

Zen, Sophia H. Chen. *Symposium on Chinese Culture, China Institute of Pacific Relations.* Shanghai: 1931.

Hu Shih. Religion and Philosophy in Chinese History.

Periodicals and Pamphlets

Chin Shih T'i Ming Pei Lu of the Ch'ing Dynasty. Supplement Number 19. Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, June, 1941.

East of Asia, An Illustrated Quarterly. Volumes I-V, 1902-6. Shanghai: 1902-6.

Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America. Washington, D. C.

International Review of Missions. London: 1912 *et seq.*

The Life. Peking: 1920 *et seq.*

T'oung Pao, ou archives concernant l'histoire, les langues, la geographie et l'ethnographie de l'Asie Orientale. Leyden: 1890 *et seq.*

Pamphlets:

T. T. Lew. *Regarding Registration of Christian Schools with the Government.* Peking: 1925.

Harley Farnsworth MacNair. *Critical Moments in the History of Christianity in China.* Shanghai: 1925. (Reprinted, *China Christian Year Book, 1926*, pp. 196-223.)

VITA

Alice Henrietta Gregg was born in Mars Bluff, Florence County, South Carolina, on April 10, 1893.

Degrees: A.B., 1914, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.; B.S., 1921, Teachers College, Columbia University; M.A., 1928, (Psychology) Columbia University.

Awards: Mary Mildred Sullivan Award to Outstanding Alumna of Winthrop College, 1941; Medal for Excellence, Columbia University, 1942.

Publications: Articles in *The Chinese Recorder*, *The Educational Review*, *The China Christian Yearbook*, *et al;* author of two chapters (Children's Work) in *Religious Education, The Report of a Deputation*, 1931, and parts of other chapters; (in Chinese) *Signposts in Religious Education; Learning to Live Series*, I and II; with Professor Newton Chiang, *Our Heavenly Father's World*, Vol. I, Graded Sunday School Series.

NOTES

Chapter I, China and the Western Powers, 1807-1902

[1] Eliza A. Morrison, *Memoirs of Robert Morrison,* Vol. II, p. 505.

[2] Geo. Nye Steiger, *China and the Occident,* Chapter V, "Tz'u Hsi and Conservative Reform."

[3] L. W. Pilcher, "The New Education in China," *Chinese Recorder,* July, 1889, p. 305; Aug., pp. 343-46, cites Reforms as imperative reason for the teaching of English.

[4] Roswell S. Britton, *The Chinese Periodical Press, 1800-1912* Young J. Allen, pp. 52-55; Timothy Richard, *see* index.

[5] Editorials, *Chinese Recorder,* Nov., 1895, p. 545; Feb., 1896, pp. 101-2; July, 1896, p. 358; January, 1897, p. 43.

[6] "The Reform Movement in China," *ibid.,* Sept. 1900 (re-printed from *The Outlook*), p. 465. Headland reports that "few people in the world had a larger collection of the wonders of modern invention than the young Emperor himself."

[7] *Op. cit.,* pp. 467-69. Twenty-seven reform decrees are listed.

[8] *Op. cit.,* p. 468.

[9] *Op. cit.,* p. 469.

[10] P. W. Kuo, *The Chinese System of Public Education,* p. 62.

[11] John C. Ferguson, "Government Schools in China," *China Mission Year Book,* 1910: "The aim of the system was to produce men of parts who would stand high in the examinations for degrees, and those teachers were considered best . . . who had the largest number of successful candidates."

[12] Kuo, *op. cit.,* p. 63.

[13] Pilcher, *op. cit.,* p. 309. Kuo (*op. cit.,* p. 67) quotes a writer of the time who hailed the introduction of science and mathematics into the examination system as a step comparable to the insertion of the thin edge of a wedge which would, in the end, rive the old wall of conservatism asunder.

[14] Pilcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 308, 344; Kuo, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[15] Kuo, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-6.

[16] Thomas Edward La Fargue, *China's First Hundred*. An account of Yung Wing's "Educational Commission" of one hundred and twenty adolescent boys who studied in New England between 1872-1881. Upon the death of the Marquis Tseng Kuo-fan, Yung Wing's sponsor, the Commission was recalled. Most returned, but a few remained and completed their education.

Other groups also went abroad. *See* Kuo, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-9; Cyrus H. Peake, *Nationalism and Education in Modern China*, p. 13.

[17] "Book Reviews," *Chinese Recorder*, July-August, 1883, p. 332.

[18] This work is known in English under various titles. Peake, *op. cit.*, p. 15, refers to it as *An Exhortation to Learning*. S. I. Woodbridge translated it, and it first appeared in the Educational Department of the *Chinese Recorder*, November, 1898, through September, 1899, under the title "Learn!" Later, he published it in book form—*China's Only Hope*.

[19] Morrison, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., pp. 253-58, 288, 289-94 tell of his own difficulties in remaining at Macao; pp. 364 ff. describe the situation which forced William Milne, the first colleague sent him, to remove from Macao to Malacca. *See also*, E. Box, "Morrison, Milne, and Medhurst," *Chinese Recorder*, Feb., pp. 79-89; March, 1904, pp. 117-26. Medhurst was the only one of the three who was alive at the opening of the treaty ports in 1842. He lived in Shanghai for some fifteen years—presumably on "Medhurst Road."

[20] George H. Danton, *The Culture Contacts of the United States and China*, 34 ff. *Also*, Susan Reed Stifler, "Elijah Coleman Bridgman, The First American Sinologist," *Notes on Far Eastern Studies in America* (No. 10), Jan., 1942, 1-11. Through Morrison's correspondence, as corresponding member of American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), the first American missionary, Bridgman, arrived in Canton in 1830. Morrison's early British colleagues were driven away, and when the Chinese officials relaxed their vigilance, he was not able to interest the London Missionary Society in sending anyone to Canton. Bridgman was his first colleague, arriving in 1830, four years before Morrison's death.

[21] Timothy Richard, "Relation of Christian Missions to the Chinese Government," *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China*, 1890. *See also*, "Presentation of the Protestant Memorial to the Chinese Government," *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1896, 105-7. The *Chinese Recorder*, 1895, contains accounts of a number of massacres in different sections of China in that year.

Note: According to Dr. Hu Shih, Timothy Richard was mistaken in thinking of the *Ching Shih Wen* as "official." In reading the manuscript, Dr. Hu Shih wrote that "the *Ching Shih Wen Shu Pien* was an unofficial anthology of essays on timely subjects. . . . This collection had *no* official status. It was a successful private enterprise."

Elaborating in a letter to the author (April 6, 1946), Dr. Hu Shih said that his father was represented in later series. He also explained the large collection of essays by Timothy Richard and Young J. Allen in the second series as reflecting "the intellectual fashions of the time."

[22] "New China and Its Leaders," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1898, pp. 415-17. Only Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and K'ang Yu-wei had more essays included than Timothy Richard.

[23] D. Z. Sheffield, "Missionaries and Christian Converts," *ibid.*, Dec., 1900, pp. 593-94.

Chapter II, Protestant Missionaries and Education, 1807-1902

[1] P. Kranz, "List of Educational Articles from the *Recorder* 1869-94," *Chinese Recorder*, May, 1895, 228-33. This list served as the basis of another list from which this grouping was made.

[2] *Ibid.*, "Educational Work in North China," Jan., 1896, p. 40.

[3] Morrison, *op. cit.*, II, 541.

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 426-27; pp. 512-16. The reader of the life of Robert Morrison is instantly struck with his respect for China and all things Chinese. He arrived in China only a scant dozen years after the death of the great Ch'ien Lung Emperor, and before the period of the Sino-British Wars. *See* Mary Gertrude Mason, *Western Concepts of China and the Chinese, 1840-76,* p. 252, on the unfavorable conceptions of China in the nineteenth century in contrast to the favorable conceptions in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and first part of the eighteenth century. The shift may have begun, but perhaps Morrison had read enough of the early Jesuit writings to be less impressed than most.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 514-15.

[6] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 46-7.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-2.

[8] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 514, (original plan); Vol. II, pp. 44-5, "The Charity Schools of the London Missionary Society . . . although not originally designed to do so, serve the purpose of preparatory schools from which to select youths for the College."

[9] W. H. Medhurst, *China, Its State and Prospects,* Chapter XII, "The Mission to Malacca," p. 307.

[10] *Ibid.,* Appendix II, pp. 586-92.

[11] Ellwood P. Cubberly, *A Brief History of Education,* p. 344, gives 1802 as the date of the First Factory Act; 1870, as the date of the Elementary School Act.

[12] *Op. cit.,* pp. 541-42.

[13] *Ibid.,* pp. 542-44.

[14] J. B. Jeter, *A Memoir of Mrs. Henrietta Shuck,* The First American Female Missionary to China, pp. 95-8; 105-6; 138-41; 208 ff.

[15] "First Annual Report of the Morrison Education Society," *Chinese Repository,* Vol. VI, Sept., 1837, pp. 229-44.

The first report by Mr. Brown is contained in "The Third Annual Report of the Morrison Education Society," *ibid.,* Vol. X, Oct., 1841, pp. 564-87.

Re Yung Wing, *see* W. A. P. Martin, "How May Christian Schools Influence, etc.," *Educational Review,* May, 1909, pp. 12-13.

[16] *Op. cit.,* p. 64.

[17] "Statistics of the Protestant Missions of China," *Records of the First General Conference of Protestant Missionaries 1877,* pp. 480 ff.

[18] L. B. Peet, "On Mission Schools," *Chinese Recorder,* (I, 7, 8) Nov., pp. 132-36; Dec. 1868, pp. 150-53.

[19] E. J. Eitel, "The Protestant Missions of Hongkong," *Chinese Recorder,* Jan.-Feb., 1876, pp. 24-5.

[20] James Jackson, "Objects, Methods, and Results of Higher Education in China," *ibid.,* Jan., 1893, pp. 7-8. The Rev. James Jackson was English, hence his use of the word "college" where an American would use the word "school." He came to China under the Methodist Board (American), and after more than fifteen years in the Methodist Mission in the Yangtse Valley (Central China), he became affiliated with the Episcopal Church, and contributed much to the upbuilding of Boone Middle School, College, and Divinity School.

[21] *See* the summary of D. Z. Sheffield's remarks on the changed policy of the American Board, *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China,* 1877, p. 203: "The American Board after an experience of fifty years, had considerably modified its position in regard to educational work, now making but sparing appropriations for the support of secular schools. . . . It had been found that men simply taught in Western science were harder to be reached by the Gospel than the heathen."

[22] Peet, *op. cit.;* H. V. Noyes, "On Teaching English to Chinese Assistants," *Chinese Recorder,* (I, 12) April, 1869, pp. 249-54.

[23] *Records etc., 1877, op. cit.,* p. 18.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 160-203.

[25] "The Shanghai Missionary Conference," *Chinese Recorder*, May-June, 1877, p. 248.

Mr. Fryer said that "in consequence of the need of scientific works . . . the directors of that institution [the Kiangnan Arsenal] had offered to . . . print at cost price the whole series, excepting such as might be open to any grave objections from an official point of view."

See also, Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries, 1890, Appendix E, pp. 715-19 ("General Editor's Report" and "Treasurer's Report.")

[26] James Jackson, *op. cit.*, Jan., 1893, 8, says that these books had a wide circulation among the literati of China, and that he was often called upon by gentlemen whose knowledge of Western science had been gained from these books alone. This shows that they were valuable from the standpoint of adult education.

[27] C. W. Mateer, "School Books for China," *ibid.*, Sept.-Oct., 1877, 427-32. (Classified as "Standards for Text Books," 15, above.)

[28] *Records etc., 1890*, Appendix E, pp. 716-17.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 713, "In 1886, they added Rev. Y. K. Yen and Rev. A. P. Parker as colleagues."

[30] "Some Educational Statistics," *Educational Review*, July, 1909, p. 11, gives list of charter members as 37.

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

[32] B. C. Henry, "Shall We Assist the Chinese in Acquiring a Knowledge of the English Language?" *ibid.*, May-June, 1881, pp. 225-36. (The suggestions in this article led finally to the establishment of the institution which grew into Canton Christian College, now, Lingnan.) What was a burning issue in Canton in 1881 was a burning issue in Peking in 1889. *See* L. W. Pilcher, "The New Education in China" (in three parts) July, pp. 305-10; Aug., pp. 343-48; Sept., pp. 403-10.

[33] W. T. A. Barber, "A Public Examination for Western Schools in China," *ibid.*, March, 1890, pp. 129-30.

[34] Concerning "terminology": the efforts of the School and Text Book Series Committee to fix terminology were truly herculean. *See* final report of that Committee, "Appendix E," *Records etc., 1890*, pp. 710-14; also John Fryer, "Scientific Terminology," *ibid.*, pp. 531-49; also, J. Dudgeon, "Review of a New Medical Vocabulary," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan.-Feb., 1882, pp. 91-5; May-June, pp. 177-83; July-Aug., pp. 259-65.

[35] "Scientific Terminology," *Records etc., 1890*, p. 537.

[36] Barber, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

[37] "Educational Notes," *ibid.*, Jan., 1892, pp. 31 ff. The Executive really acted as receiver. Mr. Fryer was on both committees, so that they were interlocking.

[38] *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

[39] "Examination Scheme," *ibid.*, Aug., 1900, pp. 420-23.

[40] Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

It was this conviction, in all likelihood, that led Dr. Jackson into a growing sympathy with the Anglican group. After joining the American Church Mission, he did outstanding work in connection with the building up of Boone Divinity School, Wuchang.

[41] "In Memoriam: Dr. Ernst Faber," *ibid.*, Dec., 1899, pp. 581-83. (*See also: A Century of Protestant Missions in China*, Centenary Conference, Historical Volume.)

[42] Book Review, "Western Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept.-Oct., 1874, p. 303.

[43] Book Review, "A Treatise on Education," *ibid.*, May-June, 1876, pp. 232-33.

[44] W. A. P. Martin, "Secular Literature," *Records etc. 1877*, p. 234, mentions his pleasure in reading these two works.

[45] "Notes and Items," Educational Department, *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1894, p. 295. This scheme called for the establishment of a Board of Modern Education to be placed under "the direct control of the Tsung-li Yamen and Sir Robert Hart." The last suggestion of this sort will be found in an editorial, *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1908, p. 6: "Would it not be a wise step for the Chinese government to appoint a foreign inspector-general of education to do for their enlightenment what Sir Robert Hart has done for the trade of China?"

[46] "The Relation of the Association to the Cause of General Education in China," *ibid.*, July, 1896, pp. 343-48, (reprinted from the *Records of the Second Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China, 1896*). *See also* "Educational Reform Committee," *op. cit.*, p. 349.

[47] "Some Educational Problems," *Records of the Third Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China, 1899*, pp. 34-44.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 36. At this time, all government institutions of reputation were under Westerners. *See* John C. Ferguson, "The Educational Outlook in China," *Records of the Fourth Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China, 1902*, p. 39: "At the head of each large college which the government has opened, has been a man who commenced his life in China as a Christian missionary."

[49] Kuo, *op. cit.* (footnote), p. 71, defines it as "divided into eight heads in an artificial manner." The style was stilted, and the lines of four or six characters alternated; each set of ten characters had to be antithetical in meaning. It was finally eliminated from the Examinations in 1901.

[50] E. T. Williams, "The Government and the New Learning," *Chinese Recorder*, Oct., 1899, p. 501.

[51] *Op. cit.*, pp. 500-1.

[52] "Examination Scheme," *op. cit.*, p. 420.

[53] William Remfry Hunt, "Our Backward Swing," *ibid.*, Sept., 1900, pp. 471-74.

[54] E. T. Williams, "A Present Duty," *ibid.*, Oct., 1900, p. 518.

[55] T. J. Arnold, "The Coming Problem," *ibid.*, Nov., 1900, p. 571.

[56] The Boxer War in China was followed by a tremendous outcry in the press against missionaries. *See* Ortha M. Lane, *Missions in Magazines*, pp. 54-9. Some 400 missionaries in Shanghai, representing about twenty boards, had appealed to their societies to bring pressure to restore the Kuang Hsu Emperor to the Throne wrongfully taken from him, and to punish the Empress Dowager and those responsible. This created great opposition. (*See* "Missionaries Appeal to Home Governments," *ibid.*, Oct., 1900, pp. 529-30.) The *Chinese Recorder* carries echoes of the attack of the secular press in the United States against missionaries from late 1900 on through 1903.

[57] A. P. Parker, "A New Japanese Invasion of China," *Chinese Recorder*, July, 1901, p. 359.

[58] "Notes," Educational Department, *ibid.*, May, 1901, p. 250.

[59] "Educational Reform," *ibid.*, Oct., 1901, p. 513. The writer seems entirely unaware of Chinese politics. The Court had lost such prestige through the Allied victory that it was necessary to placate their Chinese subjects. The decision to sponsor "Reform" was not in order to curry favor with despised Westerners, but to curry favor with their restless subjects.

[60] T. J. Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 573.

[61] D. Z. Sheffield, "Educational Reconstruction in Peking," *ibid.*, Dec., 1901, p. 621.

[62] "Notes," Educational Department, *ibid.*, March, 1902, pp. 140-41.

[63] Editorial, *ibid.*, April, 1902, p. 209; Fu Lan, "The Chi-nan-fu College," *ibid.*, May, 1902, p. 249.

[64] D. Z. Sheffield, *op. cit.*, pp. 621-22.

[65] Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[66] S. Couling, "The Chinese Classics in Schools," *ibid.*, Dec., 1899, p. 605.

[67] Pilcher, *op. cit.*, especially 343-46. Ernst Faber, in "The Need of Museums in China," *ibid.*, Dec., 1894, 591, stated that China could never come to an equality with Western nations in any science except through an adequate knowledge of English. The French Fathers in Shanghai were among the first to put out a textbook on English. (*See* "Notes and Items," Educational Department, Dec., 1896, 604, which complains of the unidiomatic English.)

[68] Peake, *op. cit.*, p. 54. He adds: "Here was an early shot fired in the struggle to 'Recover the Educational Prerogatives.' "

Chapter III, Years of Brewing Revolution, 1902-1909

[1] W. W. Clayson, *Chinese Recorder*, July, 1911, p. 388.

[2] "The Month," *ibid.*, June, 1908, p. 355.

[3] F. L. Hawks Pott, "Educational Progress of 1907," *ibid.*, Jan., 1908, p. 13. As early as 1901, Chang Chih-tung was reported as alarmed at the radical ideas of students returned from Japan, "Notes," *ibid.*, June, 1901, p. 308.

[4] "Diary of Events in the Far East," *ibid.*, March, 1902, p. 157. (Decree of Feb., 1902.)

[5] E. I. Doty, "The Dragon's Awakening," *ibid.*, April, 1908, pp. 210-11. *See* also *China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, pp. 722-44, ("The Missionary and Public Questions.") The position of the missionary and "converts" was a delicate one.

[6] "The Present Crisis in Christian Education," *Educational Review*, July, 1925, p. 209.

[7] A. S. Mann, "The Government and the Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, Feb., 1907, pp. 104-5. Quoted by Dr. Pott, "Education," *China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, p. 78.

[8] "Of More Value than Ten Thousand Missionaries," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1903, pp. 1-2.

[9] "Educational Department," *ibid.*, March, 1902, p. 140.

[10] Ling Chi Hong (Tokyo), "Our Chinese Students in Japan," *Educational Review*, April, 1910, p. 8. (Reprinted from *World's Chinese Students' Journal.*)

[11] J. Harada, "Japanese Educational Influence in China," *Records of the Fifth Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China, 1905*, pp. 104-5. (Reprinted, *Chinese Recorder*, July, 1905, pp. 356-61.)

[12] *Loc. cit.*

[13] Arnold Foster, "The Educational Outlook in Wuchang," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1906, p. 38.

[14] T. J. Preston, "Progress and Reform in Hunan Province," East of Asia (IV), 1905, p. 215. Hunan was ahead of Hupeh in establishing its new schools. Both these articles appear in 1905.

[15] Kuo, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

[16] You-kwang Chu, *Some Problems of a National System of Education in China*, pp. 158-60.

[17] D. Z. Sheffield, "Christian Education in Relation to Educational Reform in China," *Records of the Fourth Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China*, p. 60: "Throughout the provinces of China at the present time among officials and scholars there is going on an earnest discussion on the subject of educational reform. As to the character and

scope of this reform, their ideas are vague and obscure, but on a few points there is very general agreement."

[18] *Loc. cit.* "Christianity is to form no part and stand in no relation to the new learning. Confucianism must continue to occupy the central and fundamental place."

Dr. Sheffield came from Tungchou, near Peking. Events throughout the southern provinces in the next few years revealed no such enthusiasm for Confucianism. And, in the end, it was an Imperial Edict that, all unwittingly, dealt the deathblow to Confucianism. *See reference* 20.

[19] Peake, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

[21] Educational Department, *Chinese Recorder*, Oct., 1905, p. 516.

[22] Kuo, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[23] *Loc. cit.*, footnote: "Government schools are supported by funds appropriated by the government treasury; public schools are those maintained by local public funds; the private schools are those established by individuals and maintained by donations."

[24] "Educational Progress of 1907," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1908, p. 11.

[25] Brownell Gage, "Government Schools in Hunan," *ibid.*, Dec., 1907, pp. 667-68.

[26] Pott, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

[27] Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

[28] Peake, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-4. (Chapter II, "Modern Educational Aims.") Another version, quoting the first two and the last two of these five aims—taken from the current press—will be found quoted in A. S. Mann's, "The Government and the Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, Feb., 1907, p. 105.

[29] Fu Lan, "The Chi-nan-fu College," *Chinese Recorder*, May, 1902, p. 249, comments on the "worship of Confucius" as "strangely out of place and out of date" in a "college of western learning." *See above:* "Disillusionment."

[30] "The Worship of Confucius. Is It Idolatry?" *ibid.*, Feb., 1903, pp. 92-3.

[31] Dr. Martin's statement was produced because of the "Appeal" for funds to launch a missionary system. He approved the plan, but did not approve the stand that Christians might not attend government schools.

[32] "Statistics," *China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, p. 782.

[33] Tong Kai-son, "Difficulties of the Chinese Clergymen," *Chinese Recorder*, Feb., 1905, pp. 71-2.

A footnote (p. 70) tells us that Mr. Tong Kai-son was in the head office of the Canton-Hankow Railway in Shanghai. He was a member of Yung Wing's Educational Commission, 1873-1818, studying at Phillips Academy and at Yale. He was recalled in 1881.

[34] A. A. Gilman, "How to Awaken Interest in the Christian Message,"

ibid., June, 1910, p. 400. This was written some years after Protestant missionaries had foresworn appealing to law courts, no matter how unjustly Christians were treated. This was not always true. *See* F. W. S. O'Neill, "Our Relation to the Civil Power," *ibid.*, Aug., 1901, pp. 388-89. There was much on the subject in the *Chinese Recorders* around the year 1900.

[35] Tong Kai-son, Chinese author, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[36] Editorial, *ibid.*, April, 1907, p. 233.

[37] Editorial, *ibid.*, May, 1907, p. 280.

Note: The policy of the various missions differed. The Congregationalists, for example, were much in advance of most missions in relationships. The American Episcopalians were outstanding in the salaries paid their clergy.

Chapter IV, The Rise of a Missionary System of Education, 1902-1909

[1] The "Appeal . . . for Trained Educators for China" (Appendix B) states that there were over 100 boarding institutions, with some 5000 boarding students. The number of day schools is not given.

The figures for 1905: *see China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, p. 783.

The figures for 1909: *see Statistical Atlas for Christian Missions*, p. 78.

[2] "Status of Chinese Teachers in Mission Schools," *Records of the Fifth Triennial Meeting of the Educational Association of China*, p. 152.

[3] "The Educational Outlook in China," *Records of the Fourth Triennial etc., 1902*, pp. 39-40.

Dr. Ferguson's interpretation seems open to question. Some would see nothing "occult" in the idea expressed. However, he was right that the Chinese were proud of their own classical heritage, and that they wished only the sciences of the West.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 40-1.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

[7] *Records of the Fourth Triennial etc., 1902*, p. 30. This requested that "Christian students be not debarred from entering government institutions or required to observe ceremonies contrary to their Christian principles."

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

[9] "Notes," *Chinese Recorder*, Feb., 1903, p. 94.

[10] "The Worship of Confucius. Is It Idolatry?", *ibid.*, Feb., 1903, pp. 92-3.

[11] "Notes," *op. cit.*, pp. 93-4.

[12] *Records of the Fourth Triennial etc., 1902*, p. 30.

[13] *Records of the Fifth Triennial etc., 1905*, p. 84.

[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

[15] *Loc. cit.* This, presumably, was the committee called for at the Fourth Triennial (p. 32). It is not listed among the regular committees of that Triennial.

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.

[17] W. W. Yen, "The Recent Imperial Metropolitan Examinations," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1907, pp. 34-9. The second examination of "returned students" from the U. S., Europe, and Japan is described in this article by one of the participants, a Christian, son of the Rev. Y. K. Yen. Dr. Yen is listed as having joined the EAC in 1901. (*Records etc., 1902.*) This examination took place on "the 27th and 29th of the eighth moon" (September?) in 1906. (*Op. cit.*, p. 36.)

[18] A meeting was held at the time of the Fifth Triennial, attended by the American members, when resolutions were addressed to the President and to Congress protesting the harsh treatment accorded Chinese students who went to the United States for advanced study. These resolutions, together with the correspondence between the Rt. Rev. F. R. Graves D. D., bishop of the Shanghai diocese, and the Hon. W. W. Rockhill, U. S. Minister, Peking, are found under "Chinese Exclusion," *ibid.*, Jan., 1907, pp. 42-5.

[19] Reverend Lindenmeyer, "The Recognition of the Mission Schools by the Chinese Government," *ibid.*, Feb., 1906, pp. 96-9.

[20] *Op. cit.*, pp. 97-8.

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 98.

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

[23] A. S. Mann, "Foreign Schools and the Chinese Government," *ibid.*, March, 1906, pp. 147-50.

[24] *Op. cit.*, pp. 148-50.

[25] *Op. cit.*, p. 150.

[26] The Rev. A. S. Mann succeeded the Rev. J. A. Silsby as editor of the Educational Department at the Triennial of 1905. He was drowned in Kuling, in the attempt to save a friend, in July, 1907, at the age of twenty-nine, thereby cutting short a life that promised much usefulness. He had come to China in 1904 with Dr. F. L. Hawks Pott on his return from furlough. That he should have been elected the following year to succeed Mr. Silsby speaks for itself. His "American" attitude in his account of the "Foreign Schools and the Chinese Government" and subsequent writing on the subject may be attributed to youth and inexperience.

[27] A. S. Mann, "The Government and the Schools," *ibid.*, Feb., 1907, p. 104.

[28] *Loc. cit.* With the abolition of extraterritoriality, a graduate from an unregistered school holds a diploma that signifies nothing. There will be

no treaty port, for example, in which a doctor or lawyer from an unregistered university can function.

[29] *Loc. cit.*

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

[31] The eight names are given in a footnote; *see* W. W. Yen, *op. cit.*, p. 39: The following is a list of the *Chinshih* and their alma maters: Chen Chintao (M.S., Ph.D., Yale); W. W. Yen (B.A., University of Va.); T. B. Sia (M.D., D.D.S., Univ. of Denver); Yen Te-ching (C.E., Lehigh Univ.); Saoke Alfred Sze (M.A., Cornell Univ.); A. L. Ahlo (Cambridge Univ.); Y. C. Chang (M.L., Yale); and T. C. Hu (M.C.E., Cornell).

Two of these names—A. L. Ahlo and T. C. Hu—are not found on the official list as given in *Chin Shih T'i Ming Pei Lu of the Ch'ing Dynasty*, supplement Number 19, Harvard-Yenching Institute, Sinological Index Series, p. 19. Li Fang and Hsü Ching-wen are on the official list.

[32] Pott, "Education," *China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, pp. 64-5; 69-70; 77-8; "Discussion," pp. 500-1. Dr. Pott consistently, over a period of years, maintained that no pressure should be brought through diplomatic channels. There is strong reason for thinking that his young professor, the Rev. A. S. Mann, was expressing his President's views in his report (*op. cit.*) in February, 1907, and that Dr. Pott, in quoting this paragraph at the Centenary Conference, was quoting himself.

[33] "Education," *China Centenary Missionary Conference Records*, p. 519.

[34] "Report of the Executive Committee," *Records of the Fifth Triennial Meeting etc. 1905*, pp. 38-9.

[35] "The Educational Association of China, Its History, Opportunity, and Needs," *Educational Review*, September, 1909, pp. 4, 5, 6. After 1912, the American Methodist Board contributed Dr. Gamewell's services as General Secretary. The meager budget asked for was never contributed by the Boards. In 1924, after the visit of the Educational Commission, the Institute for Social and Religious Research made an annual grant for several years.

[36] J. P. Bruce, "Proposed Shantung Protestant University Scheme," *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1908, pp. 326-30; "Shantung Christian University," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1909, pp. 5-10.

[37] D. Z. Sheffield, "Co-ordination in Christian Education," *op. cit.*, pp. 305-9.

[38] *Op. cit.*, p. 308.

[39] "West China Union University," *Educational Review*, March, 1910, p. 11.

[40] F. L. Hawks Pott, "Education," *op. cit.*, pp. 70-77.

[41] John Darroch, "Sunday Schools in China," *China Mission Year Book*, 1911, pp. 401-4; other issues of the *Year Book; The Christian Occupation of China*, pp. 390-92, 450.

[42] "Educational Notes from Kuliang," *Chinese Recorder*, Nov., 1905, pp. 573-75.

[43] "Colleges and Universities in West China," *Educational Review*, Feb., 1911, p. 2.

[44] H. B. Graybill, "The Educational Association of Canton," *ibid.*, May, 1909, pp. 37-8. This may have been a reorganization. The first article to suggest that the Educational Association of China was a misnomer unless there were local associations came from Canton: W. M. Bridie, "Local Associations and Their Relation to the National Association," *Records of the Fourth Triennial etc., 1902,* pp. 167-69.

[45] "Notes," Educational Department, *Chinese Recorder*, April, 1903, p. 197; "New Publications," *ibid.*, June, 1904, p. 313.

[46] J. A. Silsby, "Teaching English in China," *ibid.*, Jan., 1903, p. 35.

[47] "Conference of Girls' Schools at Mokanshan," *ibid.*, Sept., 1906, p. 504.

[48] "Educational Association's Book Sales," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1909, p. 17.

There was no recognition at this time (1909) that the peak was passed. The accompanying remark was, "We shall expect to double our sales during the current triennium." The truth was that the peak was passed in 1902, when sales totaled over $12,000. It was the tremendous volume of books sold in that year that made the high sum of $27,050.97 for the three years, 1902, 1903, and 1904, reported in 1905. (*See* "Treasurer's Report" in the various Triennial Records for an analysis of the annual sales.)

[49] "Report of Publication Committee," *Records of the Fifth Triennial etc., 1905,* pp. 40-44. Pp. 41-2; "If we inquire into the small output, I think we will all agree that it is on account of the busy life the educator has to lead. The management of a school or college is no light task, and leaves but little time for scholarly work." *See also* "Report of Publication Committee," *Records of the Sixth Triennial etc., 1909,* pp. 30-2. Page 31: "Although missionary educators are overburdened with work, it must remain true that none are better qualified to prepare the sort of textbooks needed than they. . . ."

[50] *Records of the Fourth Triennial Meeting etc., 1902,* p. 24; "There is considerable profit to be expected from the publication and sale of books now. Hence authors are disposed to publish on their own account."

[51] "Report of the Publication Committee," *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[52] *Op. cit.*, p. 152. There are many articles in the *Chinese Recorder* in this period which deal with relationships between the missionary and Chinese "assistants" in general. There is no article devoted entirely, as this is, to the Chinese teacher. In our next period, as we shall see, the Chinese teacher accuses the missionary of just the things which Dr. Bergen takes for granted in 1905.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

[54] *Loc. cit.*

[55] *Loc. cit.*

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 157. This raises a question as to the "Worship of Confucius" issue: were teachers not required to perform the ceremonies?

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 157. When I arrived in China, there was a good deal of feeling against the YMCA, due in the main to the fact that they paid good salaries, and so secured as secretaries men whom the missions had been expecting to become ministers or teachers.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

Chapter V, Revolution and Renaissance, 1909-1919

[1] H. H. Lowry, "Peking, 1900-1910," *Chinese Recorder*, July, 1911, p. 384. *Also*, editorial, *ibid.*, Jan., 1911, p. 5.

[2] Editorial, *ibid.*, Nov., 1911, p. 611.

[3] Arthur H. Smith, "The Relation of the Chinese Revolution to Human Progress," *ibid.*, Jan., 1913, p. 10.

[4] The demands were outlined in 1914, but were not presented until January; the humiliating document was signed May 25, 1915.

[5] Tsui Chi, *A Short History of Chinese Civilization*, p. 258.

[6] Hu Shih, "The Present Crisis in Christian Education," *Educational Review*, July, 1925, pp. 209-10.

[7] Sophie S. Lanneau, "Chinese Poetry," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1926, p. 37. The translations are by Miss Lanneau. The poems are described as a compilation made by a Chinese member of the staff of the University of Shanghai, 1920. Note: "Foreign cloth" (*yang pu*) is the term used to describe machine-woven cloth.

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

[9] Editorial, *ibid.*, Dec., 1910, p. 755.

[10] T. T. Lew, "China's Renaissance–the Christian Opportunity," *ibid.*, May, 1921, p. 303.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 302, gives this as the preferred title in Chinese.

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 304.

[13] *Op. cit.*, pp. 303-4. *Also,* H. C. Hu, "The New Thought Movement," *ibid.*, Aug., 1923, pp. 448-50, on leaders of the Movement.

[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 303.

[15] *Loc. cit.*

[16] H. C. Hu, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

[17] *Op. cit.*, pp. 450-51.

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 452: "Although towards politics they have different ideas, yet they all insist upon democracy."

[19] "Item," *ibid.*, June, 1920, p. 442.

[20] Kuo, *op. cit.*, Chapter VI, "Reorganization of Education under the Republic." *Also,* Fong F. Sec, "Notes on Government Education," *Educational Review,* July, Oct., 1914, pp. 32-6; 28-32; "Government and Mission Education in China," *Chinese Recorder,* March, 1915, pp. 158-64.

[21] Kuo, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-20; You-kwang Chu, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-67, presents clear charts of the systems of 1903, 1912, 1922, and 1928, respectively. One important difference between the systems of 1903 and 1912 was the shortening of the entire course by three years.

[22] "Government and Missionary Education in China," March, 1915, p. 158.

[23] Peake, *op. cit.*, p. 78. *Also,* in confirmation, *see* Fong F. Sec's department, "Government Education," *Educational Review,* 1915 and 1916.

[24] Fong F. Sec, "Government Education," *Educational Review,* Oct., 1915, pp. 351-53, quotes Hollington K. Tong as follows:

> In 1911 there were approximately 39,000 schools, which included high schools, colleges, and universities, but not missionary institutions. At the end of 1914 the number had increased to 59,796. . . . Of the 60,000 schools, 37,000 were private. Peking has more than 700 schools. . . . At the end of 1914 there were 3,849,254 students, representing one per cent of the population of the country. By adding the number . . . who have studied in the old Confucian schools, it is estimated that one out of fifty people in China receives the rudiments of education. . . . During the last year of the Ch'ing dynasty only one out of 400 or more people was a student.

[25] *Op. cit.*, p. 353.

[26] "The Future Place of Education in China," *Chinese Recorder,* Jan., 1919, p. 22.

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

[28] J. C. Patton, "The Chinese Preacher," *ibid.*, Nov., 1909, pp. 628, 629-30, 632-33.

[29] *The Great Century* (History of the Expansion of Christianity, Vol. VI), p. 355.

[30] "The Returned Student in China," *Chinese Recorder,* March, 1917, pp. 158-75.

[31] "Changes of Emphasis in Missionary Work," *China Mission Year Book, 1919,* p. 67.

As one of the "younger missionaries" who came out at this time, I realize the moulding influence of T. Z. Koo's sister, my classmate for two years at the Church Training School, Philadelphia. From her, I learned of the bitterness of Chinese Christians because of the racial barriers between missionaries and Chinese. On my first furlough I studied at Teachers College where I came to know P. C. Chang, King Chu, Sanford C. C. Chen, Y. G. Chen, and many others, and to learn their ideals for Chinese education in the Chinese Educational Club.

[32] There were many missionaries who sought to enter into an appreciation of Chinese life and culture, and who went so far as to wear Chinese clothes and eat Chinese food, and otherwise live as Chinese. Such conduct was very much frowned upon by those described in an earlier chapter by Mr. Tong Kai-son as "worldly-minded foreigners" in the treaty ports.

Chapter VI, Expansion and Reorganization of Missionary Education, 1909-1919

[1] "Government and Missionary Education in China," *Chinese Recorder,* March, 1915, p. 161.

[2] *Op. cit.,* p. 161.

[3] *The Christian Occupation of China, A Survey, 1922,* pp. xciv-v.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] "The Future Place of Education in China," *Chinese Recorder,* Jan., 1919, pp. 23-4.

When Dr. Kuo speaks of "amateur educators," these had not increased since 1915. Dr. Kuo had a wider acquaintance with missionary institutions than Dr. Fong, whose work was with the Commercial Press in Shanghai.

[6] W. M. Bridie, "Local Associations and their Relation to the National Association," *Educational Review,* Sept., 1909, pp. 6-8.

[7] "Central China Christian Educational Union," *ibid.,* August, 1911, pp. 7-8.

[8] *See* reports of annual meetings of these associations.

[9] "Canton Educational Association," *ibid.,* Jan., 1910, p. 14: ". . . Higher standards of work . . . can be accomplished only by getting better teachers; and this means offering the salaries necessary to secure the better men. . . . We cannot compete with the government schools in salaries; but teachers . . . must be made comfortable."

See also, Chas. S. Keen, "Teacher Improvement–Middle Schools," *ibid.*, April, 1917, p. 86.

[10] "Report of the Kwangtung Christian Educational Association," *ibid.*, July, 1921, p. 224. Here it is stated that whereas English was formerly used, there was an increasing tendency to use Chinese. Chinese members were mentioned in the first account, "The Educational Association of Canton," *ibid.*, May, 1909, p. 37. Dr. Fong and Dr. Kuo were prominent members of the East China Christian Educational Association.

[11] "Shantung-Honan Christian Educational Association," *ibid.*, April, 1918, p. 158.

[12] Because of the lack of a general secretary, the proceedings of the Seventh Triennial, 1912, were never published. (They *may* survive in the archives of the Educational Association headquarters in the Missions Building, International Settlement, Shanghai.) Several of the papers read on that occasion were printed in the April issue of the *Chinese Recorder*, 1912.

[13] *See* "Constitution," *Educational Review*, Dec., 1913, p. 5.

[14] The heated discussion over the name of the Association is very revealing. *See* "A Chinese Educational Association," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1904, pp. 34-6; "President's Remarks," *Educational Review*, July, 1915, p. 173; "Discussion," *op. cit.*, pp. 218-21; Editorial, *ibid.*, Jan., 1916, p. 1.

[15] "The Training of Teachers in China," *ibid.*, Jan., 1924, pp. 38-42. A stenographic report of an address delivered at the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, Jan. 10, 1923.

[16] "Education and Nationalism," *ibid.*, Oct., 1925, pp. 355-57, *inter alia.*

[17] William A. McCall, "Science of Education," *ibid.*, Jan., 1923, pp. 14 ff.

[18] Dr. Sailer was for many years one of the Editorial Board. He was listed as editor for "Book Reviews, Foreign," and contributed review articles, such as "The School and Society," *ibid.*, June, 1911, pp. 1-5; "The Original Nature of Man," *ibid.*, July, 1914, pp. 22-7; *et al.*

[19] "President's Remarks," *ibid.*, July, 1915, p. 173.

[20] "Has the Educational Association Fulfilled Its Mission?" *Chinese Recorder*, Oct., 1909, p. 547.

[21] "Memorials and Communications," *Records of the Sixth Triennial of the Educational Association of China, 1909*, pp. 58-61.

[22] "Some Educational Association Statistics," *Educational Review*, July, 1909, p. 11, gives the first three items. The Chinese membership may be worked out by going over the lists of members in the Triennial *Records*.

* The nine members in 1909 were:

Prof. W. W. Yen, (St. John's College) son of the Rev. Y. K. Yen	1901
Miss Zau Fong-yuin	1905
S. N. Zau, Esq.	1907

Prof. T. H. Lee	1907
Dr. Fong F. Sec (Commerical Press)	1909
S. K. Tsao (YMCA)	1909
Archie T. L. Tsen (Boone Middle School, Wuchang)	1909
Mr. Yie Pah Shou	1909
Mr. T. Y. Chang	1909

S. K. Tsao's articles are referred to in this chapter.

[23] "Memorials and Communications," *op. cit.*, pp. 60-1.

[24] *Op. cit.*, pp. 54-5.

[25] *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

[27] "Constitution of the Educational Association of China," *Educational Review*, Dec., 1913, p. 5.

[28] "The Present Status of Missionary Schools," *Educational Review*, May, 1909, p. 3.

[29] *Op. cit.*, pp. 7-10.

[30] "The Mission School in Relation to the Government Educational System," *ibid.*, June, 1909, p. 24.

[31] "The Relation of Christian Schools to Racial and National Movements in China," *ibid.*, June, 1909, pp. 1-13.

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

[33] "Books from the Commercial Press," *Chinese Recorder*, Dec., 1904, p. 622.

See "Notes," *ibid.*, March, 1899, pp. 139-40. This is the first notice of Commercial Press books in the *Recorder*. It seems possible that this notice was given by Dr. Fong F. Sec.

[34] *Educational Review*, July, 1909, pp. 1-6.

[35] *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

[36] *Loc. cit.*

[37] *Op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

[38] *Records of the Sixth Triennial of the Educational Association of China, 1909*, pp. 71-4.

[39] *Ibid.*, Part II, p. 4.

[40] "Memorials and Communications," *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60.

[41] *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

[42] *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

[43] "West China Christian Educational Union," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1918, p. 59.

[44] H. S. Redfern, "Government Recognition of Mission Schools," *ibid.*, Oct., 1918, pp. 337-38.

[45] "The Future of the Mission School in China," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1910, p. 55.

[46] H. McC. E. Price (Anglican Bishop, Fukien), "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Government Recognition of Mission Schools," *ibid.*, April, 1912, pp. 199-206; Paul D. Bergen, "Is Recognition of Mission Schools by the Government Feasible or Desirable?" *op. cit.*, pp. 207-15.

[47] "Has the Educational Association of China Fulfilled Its Mission?" *ibid.*, Oct., 1909, p. 548.

[48] *Op. cit.*, p. 548.

[49] *Op. cit.*, p. 545.

[50] J. A. Silsby, "Foreigners and Chinese Should Co-operate," *Educational Review*, Nov., 1909, pp. 2-3.

[51] Geo. A. Stuart, *op. cit.*

[52] W. Nelson Bitton, "Some Problems of the World Missionary Conference," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1911, p. 15.

[53] Bowen, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-7.

[54] Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 544, 546-47.

[55] "In Memoriam: Dr. D. L. Anderson," *Chinese Recorder*, May, 1911, pp. 294-95. Dr. Anderson (a South Carolinian) was a student under General Robert E. Lee. His student, Y. C. Yang, was later his successor as president of Soochow University.

[56] Editorial, "The Control of Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1912, pp. 506-7.

[57] "How to Secure Chinese Co-operation," *Educational Review*, April, 1916, p. 122.

[58] Y. C. Lee, "Mission Middle School Problems from the Chinese Point of View," *ibid.*, April, 1917, p. 99.

[59] *Loc. cit.*

[60] H. L. Yee, "Teachers' Temptations," *Educational Review*, April, 1918, p. 145.

[61] "Our Book Table," *Chinese Recorder*, Oct., 1920, pp. 716-17. Quoted from *Letters from China and Japan*, by John and Alice Dewey.

[62] "The Christian Renaissance," *ibid.*, July, 1920, p. 466.

Chapter VII, Christianity in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927

[1] "Item," *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1920, p. 442: "We have been given a list of 120 new periodicals started in China within the year from May 5, 1919." F. L. Hawks Pott ("The New Thought and the New Literary

Movements", *Educational Review,* July, 1922, p. 241) reported 400 periodicals in 1922.

[2] "The Christian Renaissance," *Chinese Recorder,* July, 1920, p. 459.

The "certain political party" here seems to refer to Russian Communists. The Chinese, in general, are as averse to Russian imperialism as to any other brand.

[3] "The New Era," *ibid.,* May, 1926, p. 317.

[4] *Op. cit.,* pp. 317-18.

[5] Edgar Snow, *Red Star Over China,* pp. 140-41, quotes Mao Tse-tung as saying that he attended the historic foundation meeting of the Communist Party in Shanghai, May, 1921 and that the first provincial branch was organized the following October, in Hunan.

[6] C. S. Chang, "The Anti-Religion Movement," *Chinese Recorder,* Aug., 1923, p. 459.

[7] *Loc. cit.*

[8] *Op. cit.,* p. 467.

[9] Hu Shih, "The Indianization of China," in *Independence, Converging, and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought, and Art,* pp. 219-47.

[10] Chen Tu Siu, (Ch'en Tu-hsiu) "Christianity and the Chinese People," (translated by Y. Y. Tsu) *Chinese Recorder,* July, 1920, pp. 454-55.

[11] For an explanation of Chinese rationalism, *see* "Li Hsüeh," *Dictionary of Philosophy* (edited by Dagobert D. Runes), pp. 168-69; *also* "Chinese Philosophy," *ibid.,* pp. 51-3.

The Reason School of the Sung dynasty (960-1279) is the first of three phases in the development of Neo-Confucianism. It is this Reason School, with its abhorrence of the metaphysical, and its belief in the dynamic and orderly character of the universe—the interaction of reason and the vital force—that has left what Hu Shih terms its heritage of rationalism. (Hu Shih, "Religion and Philosophy in Chinese History," *Symposium on Chinese Culture* (edited by Sophia H. Chen Zen), speaks of "the humanistic and rationalistic mentality of the race," and hopes that "equipped with the new weapons of modern science and technology, the rationalism and humanism of the race may . . . achieve what our fathers failed to accomplish.")

[12] T. T. Lew, "China's Renaissance—the Christian Opportunity," *Chinese Recorder,* May, 1921, pp. 312-13.

[13] *Op. cit.,* pp. 454, 455, 457.

[14] P. C. Hsü, *op. cit.,* p. 465, quotes Chiang Mon-lin, one of the leaders of the "popular movement," as saying: "I don't know of any mission school product who has sacrificed his life for a patriotic cause."

[15] "The Chinese Christian Church and National Movements," *ibid.,* July, 1919, pp. 456-57.

[16] "Making Christianity Indigenous in China," *ibid.*, May, 1921, p. 323.

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 324.

[18] *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1922, pp. 384-91.

[19] J. Leighton Stuart, Lucius Porter, and John L. Childs were among the sympathetic Westerners associated with this group.

[20] "Statement of Aims of the Peking Apologetic Group," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1920, p. 637.

[21] "The Challenge in the Government School Field," *ibid.*, June, 1924, p. 373.

[22] T. C. Chao, "Christians and Non-Christians Reply to the Anti-Christian Movement," *ibid.*, Dec., 1922, pp. 743-48.

[23] K. S. Liu (translated by T. C. Chao), "The Anti-Religion Movement, Christianity, and Religion," *op. cit.*, pp. 748, 751-52.

[24] *Op. cit.*, pp. 748-49.

See also, Sanford C. C. Chen, "The Anti-Christian Education Movement," *Educational Review*, April, 1925, pp. 142-43, who says that the Russian ambassador won favor "either through propaganda or financial means." Documentary evidence was found in the raids on the Russian embassy, Peking, April 6, 1927, and on Arcos House, London, May 12, 1927, as to the part of Moscow in Comrade Borodin's work in China.

[25] There were a few exceptions (Correspondence, *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1921, pp. 643-46).

Dr. Wang had made the point that only Chinese leadership could make Christianity indigenous, but the sight of a Christian church or school with an upturned roof was often enough to send a missionary into rhapsodies over the "indigenization" of Christianity in China.

[26] Whereas the increase of Chinese contributors to the *Chinese Recorder* began in 1919, the change occurred in the *Educational Review* in 1924.

ARTICLES BY CHINESE

Year	*Chinese Recorder*	*Educational Review (Quarterly)*
1910	1	3
1911	4	4
1912	1	
1913	2	
1914	4	4
1915	6	8 (4 of these, "Govt. Education") *
1916	9 (2 women)	8 " " "
1917	4	9 " " "
1918	6	10 " " "
1919	14	6 " " "
1920	15	6 " " "
1921	17	5 " " "

1922	19	7	”	”	”
1923	19	7	”	”	”
1924	22	13	”	”	”
1925	17	13	”	”	”
1926	15	18	”	”	”

* “Government Education” was a regular feature in each issue, contributed by Dr. Fong F. Sec.

[27] Rachel Brooks, “Impressions of a Junior Missionary,” *ibid.*, August, 1921, pp. 554-55.

[28] T. T. Lew, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

[29] Morse and MacNair, *Far Eastern International Relations*, p. 716.

[30] Sanford C. C. Chen, “The Anti-Christian Education Movement,” *Educational Review*, April, 1925, pp. 141-49. Mr. Chen wrote as a Chinese patriot, deeply incensed over an outside power dictating in Chinese politics.

[31] Morse and MacNair, *op. cit.*, p. 739.

Chapter VIII, Missionary Education in the Rising Tide of Nationalism, 1919-1927

[1] “Present Educational Tendencies in China,” *Educational Review*, April, 1920, p. 122.

[2] Paul Monroe, *Essays in Comparative Education*, p. 185. (“Mission Education and National Policy” appeared in the *International Review of Missions*, 1921.)

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

[4] Chu You-kwang, *op. cit.*, p. 163, chart.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

[6] Mr. Henry W. Luce reported 265 middle schools with an estimated attendance of 7625 students in *The Christian Occupation of China*, p. 407. Another estimate in the same volume (p. 265) is 15,000. The figure in the text lies between these two estimates.

T. Z. Koo, “Religious Life in the Colleges,” *Educational Review*, April, 1924, p. 169, reported 339 Christian middle schools and 1096 government and private middle schools.

[7] *World Missionary Atlas*, p. 78.

[8] H. C. Tsao, “The Present Situation of Christian Education in China,” *Educational Review*, Oct., 1928, p. 375.

[9] *Loc. cit.* The text says “1923.” For Kaifeng resolutions, separating education from religion, *see Educational Review*, Jan., 1925, p. 82.

[10] "The Present Crisis in Christian Education," *ibid.*, July, 1925, p. 214.

[11] "The Month," *Chinese Recorder*, Aug., 1912, p. 503.

[12] "Address to the Chihli-Shansi Christian Educational Association," *ibid.*, April, 1921, p. 133.

[13] Anderson, *Op. cit.*, p. 553 ff.

This article is immediately followed by W. Nelson Bitton, "Standards of Missionary Education in China," *Chinese Recorder*, Oct., 1909, pp. 555-65. Two more opposite points of view could scarcely be found. He says (p. 564):

> Who is there to speak the word which will make it convincingly evident . . . that it is not only a bad but an unworthy policy which waits to see what the Chinese government will do, in the vague expectation that mission institutions will hereafter be able to settle themselves down in line with whatever system the Board of Education may choose to adopt, rather than make the attempt which opportunity and duty demand to *lead the way to a national system?* (Italics are in the text.)

There is much on the subject of improving the teaching of Chinese in mission institutions after 1915. An excellent article on the subject is Dr. Pott's "Some Problems in Connection with Anglo-Chinese Education," *Educational Review*, April, 1915, pp. 71-83. ✓

[14] *Op. cit.*, pp. 131-32. (Perhaps it should be added that the Minister's address was not wholly uncomplimentary.)

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 133.

Note: the text reads "from antipathy to toleration," which does not make sense with the gist of the paragraph.

[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 466.

[17] "The Anti-Christian Education Movement," *Educational Review*, April, 1925, pp. 141-42.

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 141.

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

[20] Hsü, *op. cit.*, p. 466.

[21] "Meeting of Advisory Council," *Educational Review*, July, 1914, p. 13.

[22] "Fifth Annual Meeting of the Advisory Council," *ibid.*, July, 1919, pp. 225-26.

[23] "Seventh Annual Meeting of the Advisory Council," *ibid.*, July, 1922, pp. 249-50. (The three Chinese educators represented government, private, and Christian, *i.e.*, mission, education.)

[24] E. D. Burton, "The China Educational Commission," *ibid.*, Oct., 1921, p. 304.

[25] *Loc. cit.*

[26] *Christian Education in China,* Report of the China Educational Commission, 1921-22.

[27] *See* reports of the regional Associations at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the CCEA, *Educational Review,* July, 1924, pp. 330-342.

[28] "Fifth Annual Meeting Chihli-Shansi Christian Educational Association," *ibid,* April, 1921, pp. 160-63.

[29] "Kwangtung Christian Educational Association," *ibid.,* April, 1920, p. 181; *idem, ibid.,* July, 1921, p. 227.

[30] *Op. cit.,* p. 224.

[31] *Op. cit.,* p. 225. *See* article, *op. cit.,* pp. 248-57.

[32] Earl H. Cressy, "Government Relationships," *Educational Review,* April, 1922, p. 191.

[33] "Some Principles Contained in the Report of the *China Educational Commission,*" *ibid.,* July, 1923, p. 218. (Note the pronouns.)

[34] "Report of the Central China Christian Educational Association," *ibid.,* Oct., 1923, p. 387.

[35] *Loc. cit.*

[36] "The New Educational Association," *Educational Review,* July, 1924, pp. 255-56.

[37] "A Chinese Secretary for the China Christian Educational Association," *ibid.,* July, 1924, p. 256.

[38] Harold Balme, "The Department of Christian Higher Education," *ibid.,* July, 1923, pp. 269-71; "The Future of the Association of Christian Colleges," *ibid.,* April, 1924, pp. 149-53.

[39] *Op. cit.,* April, 1924, pp. 151 ff.

[40] The April issue of the *Educational Review* is almost entirely devoted to the College Conference in 1924 and 1926.

[41] "Christian Leadership," editorial, *ibid.,* April, 1924, p. 106.

"Among the many addresses and papers presented at the College Conference none rose to greater heights of eloquence and of vision than that of T. T. Lew on 'The Contribution of Christian Colleges to the Church.' "

"Impressions of the College Conference," *ibid.,* April, 1926, pp. 257-59. Robert F. Fitch said: "The first impression I would like to record is of the quality of the present Chinese leadership. It seems to me that as regards intellectual strength, spiritual vision, and literary quality, the finest addresses at this conference were given by our Chinese co-workers." (p. 258.)

[42] "Resolutions regarding the Registration of Schools," *ibid.,* Oct., 1924, pp. 471-72. (Chinese and English.)

[43] Howard S. Galt, "Chinese Educators in Conference," *op. cit.,* pp. 467-70. He says: "The radical speakers . . . received more applause, but opinion seemed . . . in favor of a moderate position."

[44] "Government Control of Christian Education," *ibid.*, Jan., 1925, pp. 79-80 (in Chinese), 81-2 (in English).

[45] "More Chinese," "Signs of Progress," and "The Removal of Misunderstanding," *ibid.*, Oct., 1924, pp. 387 ff.

[46] *Ibid.*, Jan., 1925, p. 8b.

[47] *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-8b. *See also*, Sanford C. C. Chen, "The Anti-Christian Education Movement," *ibid.*, April, 1925, pp. 141-42.

[48] Chen, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[49] *Op. cit.*, pp. 145-46.

[50] *Op. cit.*, pp. 147-48.

[51] *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

[52] *Op. cit.*, pp. 144-45.

[53] *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

[54] "Federation of Provincial Educational Associations," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1926, p. 104. In view of the storm which enveloped Hunan so soon thereafter—the meeting was held in Changsha—it is interesting to read that, contrary to the spirit of antagonism against Christian schools evidenced at Kaifeng the year before, "there were the most cordial social relations between the local Christian educationists and the members of the Federation." (p. 102.)

[55] Editorial, *ibid.*, Jan., 1927, p. 2: "In some cases it is evident that students have been . . . deliberately 'planted' . . . to act as 'cells' of unrest."

[56] *Op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

[57] Editorial, *ibid.*, April, 1925, p. 105.

[58] "Resolutions of the General Board," *ibid.*, July, 1925, p. 259.

[59] *Loc. cit.*

[60] Hu Shih, "The Present Crisis in Christian Education," *op. cit.*

[61] *Educational Review*, July, 1925, pp. 216-20.

[62] *Op. cit.*, pp. 202-3.

[63] *Op. cit.*, pp. 214-15.

[64] "Worship in School," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1925, p. 363.

[65] Melsom S. Tuttle, "Compulsory Chapel and the Project Method," *ibid.*, Jan., 1922, pp. 78-81; B. B. Chapman, "Compulsory or Voluntary Worship and Instruction?" *ibid.*, July, 1923, pp. 239-42; Ivan D. Ross, "Compulsory or Voluntary Worship and Instruction," *ibid.*, Oct., 1923, pp. 349-53.

[66] Among the just less than a dozen articles contributed on this topic in January, 1926, were E. D. Burton, "The Purpose of Christian Education in China," Dorothy Dickinson Barbour, "The Project Method of Teaching Religion," William F. Hummel, "Improving Religious Education in Middle Schools," E. W. Wallace, "Religion in the Middle School Curriculum," Gordon Poteat, "Training for Worship in Schools," Lin Pu Chi, "The Place

of the Bible in Religious Instruction," E. J. Winans, "A Correlated Program of Religious Education," John K. Shryock, "The Experiences of a Religious Work Director."

[67] "The Missionary Educator and the Present Situation," *ibid.*, p . 104.

[68] *Loc. cit.*

[69] "A Statement of Educational Principles," *ibid.*, April, 1925, p. 108c.

[70] "Christian Educators in Conference," *ibid.*, July, 1925, p. 204.

[71] *Loc. cit.*

[72] T. T. Lew, "Readjustments of Christian Educational Work," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1930, p. 558.

[73] *Educational Review*, Jan., 1926, pp. 99-101. (English and Chinese)

[74] "Registration of Schools," *ibid.*, July, 1926, p. 341.

Concerning the missionary difficulty with Clause 5, *see* Jackson, *op. cit.*, Dec., 1892, pp. 557-58. Dr. Jackson refused to accept the idea that the purpose of a Christian school was to make Christians. "That we all desire [it] . . . goes without saying," he said, adding: "I would say that the object of a mission school should be to give a good education. . . . This is but to fulfill an implicit engagement with those who enter our schools for the purpose of learning what we have to teach them. I do not think it is at all excusable to practise any pious fraud on this subject. . . . We cannot afford to have our schools open to the charge of giving a mere smattering of education for the purpose of getting an opportunity to proselytize."

[75] Editorial, *Educational Review*, Jan., 1927, pp. 5-6.

[76] *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

[77] "What is Happening," *Educational Review*, April, 1927, p. 102.

[78] "Christian Schools under the Nationalist Government," *ibid.*, April, 1927, p. 158.

[79] *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

[80] *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

[81] For a brief account of the events of March 24, 1927, *see* Editorial, *Chinese Recorder*, April, 1927, pp. 227-29.

Chapter IX, China Under the Kuomintang, 1927-1937

[1] Morse and MacNair, *op. cit.*, p. 741.

Professor MacNair, in this paragraph, tells of a Communist seizure of Canton on December 11, 1927, with looting and burning, and of its reseizure by Kuomintang forces three days later, followed by a purging of

Communists, Chinese and Russian. He adds that a similar purging took place simultaneously at Hankow. If so, it was not the first at Hankow. *See* A. A. Gilman, "Christian Schools in Central China," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1927, p. 414:

> Now the storm has passed. Not a few of the Chinese gentry, reckoned as wealthy and oppressors, were killed by the so-called Farmers' Union; but now a far greater number of Bolshevist agents are daily being shot.

[2] H. C. Tsao, "The Nationalist Government and Education," *ibid.*, April, 1928, p. 188. This is a quotation of the first sentence of the "General Proclamation" issued by the Fourth Plenary Conference of the Kuomintang, Feb. 7, 1928.

[3] Tsao, "New Movements in Chinese Education," *ibid.*, July, 1927, p. 278: "The government education of this region is at a standstill. The extremists claim that propaganda is more important than education in the revolution."

[4] Tsao, "Nationalist Government and Education," *ibid.*, Oct., 1927, p. 407.

[5] *Loc. cit.* Mr. Tsao says:

> The split in the Kuomintang party was indicated in the fact that the moderate side wished to maintain the Commission . . . while the radical side went ahead to establish a Ministry of Education at Wuhan, with Ku Mong-yu appointed as minister.

[6] Cressy, "Putting Students in Their Place," *ibid.*, Oct., 1927, p. 318. After a description of the demands of the Students' Union, Dr. Cressy says:

> The Central Educational Commission answered these, item by item, with a hard-headed practicalness and caustic wit that have brought joy to the hearts of all long-suffering administrators and teachers. The demands and replies are printed elsewhere in this issue (*see* pages 411-13).
>
> This is one of the most hopeful educational events that have taken place in many years. We congratulate the Commission. . . .

[7] Tsao, "New Movements in Chinese Education," *op. cit.*, p. 277. This article begins with a description of the new system of education based upon the French, in which both academic and administrative work would be centralized in the national and local educational institutions (p. 275). The Central Educational Commission was designed as a "further step" toward creating an educational system which should be academic rather than political in nature (p. 277).

[8] "Item," *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1931, p. 198.

[9] A. L. Warnshuis, (quoted) *ibid.*, June, 1931, p. 397.

[10] The exhibits of the handwork of the school children in Anking, which had formerly been a quiet, conservative, provincial capital, was probably

typical of what was taking place all over the country. George Osborn, who wrote the "Prologue" of Ronald Rees's book, says that "somehow peace was maintained between China and Japan through 1936, in spite of five incidents in which Japanese were murdered." (Ronald D. Rees, *China Faces the Storm*, p. 15.)

[11] L. Carrington Goodrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-29. These two pages give a concise summary of the achievements of the Chinese Republic.

[12] "China's Challenge to Christianity," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1934, p. 37.

[13] *Loc. cit. Also,* P. C. Hsü, "Can the Church Help in Rural Reconstruction?" *ibid.*, Jan., 1937, pp. 19-20; and "Lessons from the Lichwan Experiment," *ibid.*, Nov., 1937, p. 67 ff. This last says that the missionaries met in Kuling to discuss how Christianity might challenge young people, and that Madame Chiang, who was present, made the proposal at that time.

[14] "Work and Workers," *ibid.*, March, 1935, p. 190.

[15] "The Rural Reconstruction Movement," *ibid.*, Jan., 1936, p. 50.

[16] The Editorial, "Rural Education," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1929, p. 1, hails the establishment of Cheeloo's Rural department as "the beginning of a new chapter in the spread of Christianity among the vast farming population of China."

[17] Many accounts are in the *Chinese Recorder* and *Educational Review*, 1935-37.

[18] The price of an old culture, which insists that marriage is *not* a personal affair and makes a private marriage unheard of.

[19] Tsui Chi, *A Short History of Chinese Civilization*, p. 263.

[20] George W. Hinman, "Jobless Graduates," *Chinese Recorder*, August, 1935, pp. 470-73. Inspired by J. Leighton Stuart's article, *Asia*, May, 1935, in which he asks: "Has China Too Many College Graduates?"

[21] Kiang Wen-han, "Secularization of Christian Colleges in China," *ibid.*, May, 1937, pp. 304-5.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 303. This classification leaves a question mark: What, then, were the pro-Japanese, anti-Kuomintang group to be called if the Kuomintang were the fascist group?

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 304. *See* T. T. Lew. This concern with the social sciences was noted by him in 1930.

[24] "Religious Liberty in China," *ibid.*, March, 1928, p. 156.

See also Father Paschal D'Elia, S.J., "Catholic Native Episcopacy in China, A New Policy or a New Era?" *ibid.*, May-June, 1927, pp. 347-58. Eight Chinese bishops were consecrated by His Holiness, Pope Pius XI in Rome, Oct. 28, 1926, the seventh anniversary of his own "Episcopal Consecration" (p. 347).

[25] "What Christian Missionaries Have Endured," August, 1930.

[26] "Protestant Captives and Martyrs," *Chinese Recorder*, Nov., 1935, pp. 704-6.

[27] The policy of the Recorder from 1923 onward was to include articles by Roman Catholics and news items from *Fides* and *The Rock*, two Roman Catholic publications. One of these items (February, 1931, p. 128) reported one bishop, 24 priests and 20 sisters in captivity at one time. Another (March, 1932, p. 189) reads: "The Vicariate of Ichang is known as the 'Mission of Blood.' "

[28] "Christian Schools under the Nationalist Government," *Educational Review*, April, 1927, p. 159.

[29] "Changing Social and Intellectual Conditions," *Chinese Recorder*, August, 1930, p. 488.

Chapter X, From "Missionary" to Chinese Christian Education

[1] Paul R. Reynolds, "Religion and Revolution," *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1934, pp. 363-64.

[2] Editorial, *ibid.*, June, 1927, pp. 359-60.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] "The Fallacy of the Moment," *Educational Review*, July, 1927, p. 213.

[5] Editorial, *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1928, p. 3.

[6] Chinese students who received money with which to attend mission schools and propagate Communism thought that any scholarship student in a mission school was being paid to propagate capitalism. This was a very potent reason for getting rid of treaty protection.

Also, see T. C. Chao, "The Christian in China and International Arrangements," *Chinese Recorder*, April, 1924, pp. 242-43; "Some Thoughts on International Agreements," *ibid.*, Nov., 1924, pp. 701-5.

[7] "Christian Schools under the Nationalist Government," *op. cit.*, p. 160.

[8] "Registration in Szechuan," news item, *Educational Review*, January, 1928, p. 111.

[9] "Should Christian Schools Open this Fall?" *ibid.*, July, 1927, pp. 210-11.

[10] "The Fallacy of the Moment," *ibid.*, July, 1927, p. 213.

[11] "Christian Education" (Findings of the Delegates from China), *ibid.*, Jan., 1929, pp. 22-3. Also, incorporated in the *Report* of the Jerusalem Meeting, II, chapter IV.

[12] "The Present Situation of Christian Education in China," *ibid.*, Oct., 1928, p. 379. Pictures of six of these new presidents and vice-presidents appeared as the frontispiece, April, 1928.

[13] *Loc. cit.*

[14] Chester S. Miao and Frank W. Price, "Religion and Character in Christian Middle Schools," *ibid.*, Oct., 1929, p. 376. Also published in book form.

[15] Earl H. Cressy, editorial, *ibid.*, Jan., 1928, p. 4. *See also* Lewis Hodous, "Religious Liberty in China," *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1928, p. 156: "The Chinese Christians demonstrated that they were nationalists."

[16] "Missionaries in Educational Institutions," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1927, p. 380.

[17] *Loc. cit.*

[18] "News," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1929, pp. 100-2, quoted from *The China Press*, Nov. 20, 1928.

[19] H. C. Tsao, "The Nationalist Government and Education," *ibid.*, Oct., 1927, pp. 408-9.

[20] Leung, *op. cit.*, pp. 381-82.

[21] "Government Education," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1928, p. 392. St. John's University was the one Christian college which succeeded in remaining open without complying with registration requirements. The Lutheran College which was opened in Hunan in 1924 and closed by the general situation in Central China in 1926-27, never re-opened because of the government attitude toward religious education.

[22] Sanford C. C. Ch'en, "Government Attitude toward Christian Schools," *ibid.*, July, 1927, p. 281.

[23] "The Threat to Religious Freedom," *ibid.*, April, 1927, p. 105.

[24] "The Registration of Christian Schools in Canton," *op. cit.*, pp. 213-16.

[25] Editorials, *Educational Review*, July, 1927, pp. 210-16b; Oct., 1927, pp. 311-19.

[26] C. C. Chih, "A New Movement in Christian Education in Chekiang," *ibid.*, July, 1927, pp. 272-74.

[27] *Ibid.*, Jan., 1928, p. 5.

[28] "Government Attitude toward Christian Schools," *op. cit.*, p. 282.

[29] "Christian Educators in Conference," *Educational Review*, July, 1928, p. 285.

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 287. This account of Dr. Wallace's verifies an estimate made by the Rev. Robert M. Mateer many years before. *See* "Work of the Mission in Relation to the Chinese Church," *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1913, p. 353:

> As missionaries, we are the most fortunate in having the pick of all the countries, not only in the fact that the Chinese furnish the most promising material for a great Christian Church, but also in the fact

that they are the easiest to work with in a co-operative way. They are manly, lovable, practical, energetic, and, when responsibility is laid upon them, conservative. What does this leave to be desired?

[31] Earl H. Cressy, "The Other Cheek," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1928, p. 3.

[32] "What America is Thinking of Education in China," *ibid.*, Jan., 1929, p. 4.

[33] "Opinions of Christian Educationists," *ibid.*, April, 1928, pp. 133-35.

[34] News item, *Chinese Recorder*, Aug., 1928, p. 531.

[35] "Letter Addressed to the Churches of China," *Educational Review*, January, 1929, pp. 46-7.

[36] "Statement of Principles Regarding Religious Instruction in Schools," *ibid.*, January, 1929, pp. 48-9.

[37] "Mission Schools and Government Education," *ibid.*, April, 1927, pp. 189-90.

[38] "China Council and Registration of Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, October, 1927, pp. 671-73.

[39] Miao and Price, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

[40] *See* news item, *Chinese Recorder*, September, 1930, quoting from *North China Daily News*, Aug. 3, 1930. A Chinese principal seized a school closed by the Presbyterian Mission in Paotingfu, applied for and received registration in his own name. "The incident is a phase in the battle between the foreign missionaries and the Education ministry at Nanking. . . ."

[41] Miao and Price, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

[42] *Op. cit.*, p. 378.

[43] "Registration Trends," *Educational Review*, April, 1929, pp. 160-61.

[44] *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

[45] *Op. cit.*, p. 162. D. Tagawa, "Christianity in Japan," *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1929, p. 144.

[46] "New Regulations for Private Schools," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1929, p. 447.

[47] *See* Chiang Mon-lin's letter. As the government curriculum provided for no elective courses in junior middle school, although only primary schools are mentioned, religion was also excluded from the junior middle school.

[48] "The Petition of the Chinese Churches to the National Government . . . ," *Educational Review*, Oct., 1930, p. 374.

[49] *Op. cit.*, pp. 374, 376, 378. The petition was signed by:

1. Church of Christ in China
2. Methodist Episcopal Church
3. American Baptist Church
4. Church of Sweden Missionary Society
5. Evangelical Church

6. Church of the Brethren
7. Rhenish Missionary Society
8. Methodist Protestant Church
9. Church of Basel Mission
10. United Methodist Church
11. Chung Hwa Sheng Kung Hui *
12. United Lutheran
13. English Baptist Church of Shensi
14. Southern Baptist Church of Liangkuang
15. United Church of West China

* Anglican

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 380-81. Immediately following this (p. 382) there was "An Explanation of the Government's Policy" taken from the *North China Daily News*, which, in turn, had translated it from the *Kuo Min*. It shows that there was also pressure upon the Nanking Government to prohibit children under thirteen from attending services of any kind. "The Ministry disapproved the proposal of the Chekiang Provincial Department of Education that all children under the age of thirteen should be expressly prohibited from attending any religious service, pointing out that such a measure is contrary to the principle of religious toleration. . . ."

The "petition" had asked for the right of private schools to experiment with new educational theories in these terms:

> "We firmly believe that education without religion is incomplete. The religion of Jesus Christ . . . does not close the mind of an intelligent student, but guides him to understand the true meaning of life. . . . Dr. Sun fought a good fight for our country for over forty years. He was educated in church schools and even on his death bed, he proclaimed that he was a Christian. . . . He did not suspect church schools as institutions to drug youth and make them apathetic. . . ."

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 351-86.

[52] Wu Yi-fang, "A Possible Way Ahead for Christian Schools," *ibid.*, p. 362.

[53] Francis C. M. Wei, "The Course of Action for the Christian School," *ibid.*, p. 369.

[54] *Op. cit.*, p. 368.

[55] "Adaptation Needed," *op. cit.*, pp. 370-71.

[56] James H. Pott, "Supervision of Primary Schools," *Educational Review*, April, 1932, p. 170, reports that fourteen primary schools were opened in 1929, after a lapse of two years. In 1927 there had been 31 schools.

[57] "Christian Primary School Education in China," *ibid.*, July, 1933, p. 247.

[58] Ida Belle Lewis, (Mrs. Main) "The Christian Primary School," *ibid.*, April, 1923, p. 126.

[59] Main, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

[60] *World Missionary Atlas*, 1925, p. 78.

[61] Earl H. Cressy, "The Present Status of Christian Schools," *Chinese Recorder*, September, 1936, p. 539.

[62] *Op. cit.*, pp. 539-40. These citations may give a false impression of the article. The purpose in writing was to call attention to the fact that 250 middle schools were still too many and that more mergers were needed. The economic depression in the West had so reduced the support of these schools that they were falling behind.

[63] Contributors were: J. Leighton Stuart (5), George W. Hinman (4), Y. P. Mei (2), Y. C. Tu (2), F. L. Hawks Pott, T. T. Lew, A. A. Gilman, E. W. Wallace, W. R. Morse, Herman C. E. Liu, Baen E. Lee, Didaskalos, Y. C. Yang, Gordon Poteat, Earl H. Cressy, J. Usang Ly, Shuming T. Liu, Kiang Wen-han, John S. Barr, R. T. Moyer, John C. Griffith, and Clara Pearl Dyer.

[64] "Some Problems in connection with Anglo-Chinese Education," *Educational Review*, April, 1915, p. 76. *See also* D. L. Anderson, quoted, "Growing Antagonism toward Christian Schools," (chapter VIII, this study).

[65] The April issue, *ibid.*, 1926, is devoted to the College Conference. These are the last articles of this type.

[66] "Changing Social and Intellectual Conditions," *Chinese Recorder*, August, 1930, p. 488.

[67] "Secularization of Christian Colleges," *ibid.*, May, 1937, pp. 304-5.

[68] "The Future of Religious Education," *Educational Review*, July, 1928, p. 162.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[70] *Loc. cit.*

[71] *Op. cit.*, pp. 166-67. During the first few years, perhaps until 1932 or later, there were many critics of Dr. Stuart who complained that he did not "push" in religious matters. He was abundantly justified, however, in the steady growth of the religious life in Yenching, especially after the Japanese invasion of North China.

[72] *See* Virginia Blick, "True Light Religious Center," *Educational Review*, January, 1931, pp. 24-30; Alice M. Huggins, "The Church Members' Meeting," *ibid.*, November, 1934, pp. 398-403; Leland Holland, "A Church Members' Church," November, 1934, pp. 404-8.

[73] "Four Years After," *ibid.*, Oct., 1931, p. 447.

[74] *Op. cit.*, p. 449.

[75] Middle School Principals Meet in Kiukiang," *Educational Review*, July, 1933, p. 269.

[76] Cressy, *op. cit.*, p. 543.

[77] Main, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

[78] *Religious Education in the Chinese Church,* The Report of a Deputation, pp. 4-5.

[79] *Op. cit.,* pp. 10-12. *See also,* Alice Gregg, "The National Committee for Christian Religious Education," *China Christian Year Book,* 1934-35.

[80] Ronald D. Rees, "All-China Conference on Religious Education," *Educational Review,* Oct., 1931, pp. 377-78, says:

"The common mess was a feature of this conference. Usually it is thought necessary to divide on the basis of foreign and Chinese food. For this occasion we determined to eat together. . . . The plan worked out well."

It may seem a simple thing to have done—the planning of a foreign-style breakfast for all, and Chinese-style lunch and supper, with the addition of fruit or ice cream—but it removed the invisible walls which the Fact-Finders had found and concerning which they said that social psychologists were needed to explore and devise techniques for overcoming the points of friction. *See China,* Vol. V, Part II, pp. 104-5 (Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Fact-Finders' Reports.)

[81] Alice Gregg, *op. cit.,* p. 248.

[82] Rees, *op. cit.,* p. 381.

[83] Quentin K. Y. Huang, "The Youth Group of the National Conference on Religious Education," *Educational Review,* Oct., 1931, p. 394.

[84] Quoted, Alice Gregg, "Religious Education, 1937-1939, *China Christian Year Book,* 1938-39, p. 227.

[85] *See The Inner Life of the Church,* The Madras Series, Vol. IV, p. 7. The Report of the China Delegation says:

"The pioneer and persistent efforts of Dr. T. T. Lew, as represented by *An Experimental Series of Christian Liturgies, Personal Devotion Series, The Message and Work of the Church Series,* and *The Amethyst* (a quarterly journal of fellowship, worship, and devotion) have for the past ten years been quietly promoting deeper spiritual devotion, among both individuals and groups, and more dignified and beautiful worship."

[86] "The Future of the Church," *Chinese Recorder,* July-August, 1938, p. 347.

[87] *Op. cit.,* p. 349. "Force of circumstances has turned Jesus into a Confucius. Those who follow him do so because of his character, not because of his religion."

[88] Mrs. C. C. Chen, "The Place of Foreigners in Christian Institutions of Primary and Secondary Grade," *Educational Review,* Jan., 1928, pp. 36-7.

[89] Dr. Marjorie Rankin, Nankai University, contributed a series, "Letters to Primary School Teachers," in 1932.

[90] Leung, *op. cit.,* p. 382.

[91] Leung, *op. cit.,* p. 383. (Part II of this article is in the first issue of 1928.)

[92] *Op. cit.,* p. 37.

[93] "The Foreigner in the Middle School," *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 45.

[95] E. H. Clayton, "The Place of the Foreigner in Secondary Schools," *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[96] Editorial, *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1931, pp. 136-37. In part this concentration in institutions was due to conditions described in the last paragraph of Chapter IX.

[97] "Why I Have Not Become a Christian," *ibid.*, June, 1935, pp. 340-44, is the only article to be found in these ten years critical of missionaries.

[98] *China*, Vol. V, Part II, pp. 92-3 (Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Factfinders' Reports).

[99] Miao and Price, *op. cit., Educational Review*, Jan., 1930, p. 14.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[101] "Future of Christian Colleges," *ibid.*, Feb., 1937, p. 78.

[102] Kiang Wen-han, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

Chapter XI, Summary

[1] This study ends with 1937, the year the Sino-Japanese war began in China proper. Over and over Chiang Kai-shek has expressed to the missionaries his appreciation of their service in China during these years. Not only in words, but in small personal cheques from the government to Western teachers in refugee institutions, for "standing by," the Westerners have been recognized.

[2] T. T. Lew, "Changing Social and Intellectual Conditions," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1930, pp. 560-61.

[3] L. Carrington Goodrich, *The Literary Inquisition of Ch'ien Lung*.

[4] "The Foreign Missionaries' Relation to the Chinese," *Chinese Recorder*, Sept., 1885, pp. 333 ff.

[5] "The Opportunity of Educated Christian Chinese Young Men at the Present Time," *ibid.*, Sept., 1894, p. 420.

[6] "Of More Value than a Thousand Missionaries," *ibid.*, Jan., 1903, p. 3.

[7] *Loc. cit.*

[8] *Op. cit.* p. 53.

[9] *Op. cit.*, pp. 52-3.

[10] "The Apologetic for China," *Chinese Recorder*, Jan., 1910, pp. 14-15.

[11] Not every school deserved the unsought notoriety of these years when "cultural imperialism" was used as political propaganda. Some mission institutions had Chinese departments which were the equal of, or were

better than, some government institutions. In this issue, as in the issue over compulsory religious education, it was a case of the chain being no stronger than its weakest link.

[12] *Chinese Recorder*, June, 1922, pp. 384-91.

[13] News item, *ibid.*, June, 1928, p. 398.

Sleuthing reveals this one reference to so important a measure. There is no mention at all in the *Educational Review*. News items were not indexed in the *Chinese Recorder*. This announcement, could it have been made two or three years earlier, when propaganda was at its height, would have been very disconcerting to the propagandists.

[14] S. I. Woodbridge, "Some Effects of the Revolution on the Chinese Church," *ibid.*, Jan., 1918, p. 15.

[15] A title in the Table of Contents, *ibid.*, 1895, a year of many massacres, reads: "Antagonisms against the Missionary: Is this because he is a Missionary or because he is a Foreigner?".

[16] Simmons, *op. cit.*, pp. 333 ff.

[17] "The Nationalism of a Chinese Christian," *Chinese Recorder*, March, 1909, p. 153.

[18] In this connection it may be pointed out that there is far greater religious toleration in China than in Mexico, where religious meetings are forbidden by law in any building—home, hotel, or any other—except a church building. A visit to that country in July, 1941, was an eye-opener to one coming from China where a Christian community might begin as a group in some home long before a church was erected.

[19] News item, *Chinese Recorder*, Nov., 1934, p. 733.

[20] Between 1900-1911, it was unusual if the *Chinese Recorder* did not include several articles annually by missionaries who were concerned to improve the un-Christian relationships between missionaries and Chinese.

[21] Wm. N. Brewster, "How to Conquer a Permanent Peace in China" *Chinese Recorder*, Dec., 1901, pp. 393-96.

Mr. Brewster, after witnessing a Westerner lay about him with a chain, suggests that the majority of the representatives of "Christian civilization" in China organize a "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Chinese."

[22] Missionaries from the coastal provinces and Yangtse Valley who refugeed with Chinese fellow workers found in the remoter sections of Kiangsi and other southwestern provinces missionaries who had never met modern Chinese and who, while willing to take in Westerners for a night or for a meal, expected the Chinese to go to the inn. It was a revelation for these when the missionaries in such instances also went to the inn.

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

[24] "The Effect of the War on Missions in China," *Chinese Recorder*, January, 1916, pp. 20-1.

[25] David M. Paton, "The World-Wide Task of the Christian Church," *Chinese Recorder*, July, 1941, p. 369.

[26] Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Fact Finders' Reports, *China*, Vol. V, Part II, pp. 91-2, 104-5.

Chapter XII, China—A Forecast

[1] *CHINA Looks Forward*, pp. 144-45. The *New York Times*, Jan. 15, 1946, p. 14, reported that Sun Fo's proposals had been accepted as the basis for negotiations with the Communists. No Chinese communist could have stronger views on the necessity for economic democracy than Sun Fo, but he is too Chinese to be willing to join a small group of ideologists in any attempt to seize power, suppress all freedom of speech, and attempt to impose a Russian pattern. He stands with the vast majority of Chinese in their determination to win democracy on the national level, *i.e.*, to be treated as an equal in the family of nations, and to work out their national salvation in their own way.

INDEXES

I. *Westerners*

ADAMS, Marie, 187
Allen, Young J., 9, 48, 196, ~~219~~, ~~221~~
Anderson, D. L., 82, 86, 89, 93-5, 96-7, 118-19, 121, 197, 237, 240, 250
Anderson, David F., 183
Arnold, T. J., 225

BALME, Harold, 242
Barber, W. T. A., 20-22, 223
Barbour, Dorothy Dickinson, 243
Barr, John S., 190, 249
Bentley, W. P., 218
Bergen, Paul D., 43, 62-4, 204, 206, 236
Bitton, W. Nelson, 237, 239-40
Blick, Virginia, 251
Blodgett, Henry, 195
Borodin, Michael, 111, 112, 113, 141-42, 157, 162, 167, 239
Bowen, A. J., 120, 123-34, 197, 237
Boynton, Chas. L. and Chas. D., 212
Box, E., 220
Brewster, Wm. N., 254
Bridgman, Elijah Coleman, 220
Bridie, W. M., 231, 234
Britton, Roswell S., 219
Brooks, Rachel, 110-11, 239
Brown, S. R. (Yale), 15, 222
Bruce, J. P., 230
Bryan, R. T., 90
Burton, E. D., 122, 133, 241, 243
Butterfield, Kenyon L., 122, 148

CHAPMAN, B. B., 243
Childs, John L., 238
Clayson, W. W., 226
Clayton, E. H., 252
Corbett, Hunter, 90
Corley, Jesse Lee, 185
Couling, S., 40, 225
Cressy, Earl H., 124, 137, 156, 158, 161, 164-65, 166-67, 179, 184, 242, 245, 247, 248, 250, 251
Cubberly, Ellwood P., 222

DANTON, Geo. H., 220
Darroch, John, 230
D'Elia, S. J., Father Paschal, 246
Dewey, John and Alice, 70, 100, 114, 237
Didaskalos, 250
Doty, E. I., 226
Dudgeon, J., 223
Dyer, Clara Pearl, 250

EITEL, E. J., 222

FABER, Ernst, 32, 224, 225
Ferguson, John C., 44, 49, ~~219~~, 224, 228
Fitch, Robert F., 204, 242
Foster, Arnold, 52, 226, 227
Fryer, John, 19-21, 223-24
Fu Lan, 227

GAGE, Brownell, 36, 227
Galt, Howard S., 242
Gamewell, Frank D., 80, 121, 122, 126, 230
Gilman, A. A., 39, 227-28, 244, 250
Goodrich, L. Carrington, 245, 253
Graves, F. R., 229
Graybill, H. B., 122, 124, 231
Gregg, Alice H., 185, 187, 251
Griffith, John C., 250

HAMMOND, Louise Strong, 204
Hart, Sir Robert, 224
Hayes, W. M., 27
Headland, Isaac T., 5, 11, 219
Henry, B. C., 223
Hinman, Geo. W., 150, 245, 250
Hobson, Dr., 21
Hodous, Lewis, 152, 247
Holland, Leland, 251
Hoste, D. E., 203-4
Huggins, Alice M., 251
Hummel, Wm. F., 243
Hunt, Wm. Remfrey, 225
Huntington, D. T., 134

JACKSON, James, 18, 20, 22, 28, 222, 223, 224, 244
Jamieson, George, 9
Jeter, J. B., 222

KEEN, Chas. L., 234
Kranz, P., 221

LA FARGUE, Thomas Edward, 220
Lambert, Clara J., 122
Lane, Ortha M., 225
Lanneau, Sophie S., 232
Latourette, Kenneth Scott, 74-5, 233
Legge, James, 17-18
Lindenmeyer, Reverend, 50, 89, 229
Lobenstine, E. C., 122, 148-49
Lowry, H. H., 232
Luce, Henry W., 240
Lyman, E. R., 218

MACNAIR, Harley Farnsworth, 111-12, 112-13, 240, 244
McCall, Wm. A., 82, 235
Main, Mrs. Idabelle Lewis, 176-77, 184, 189, 250, 251
Mann, A. S., 51, 52-4, 226, 227, 229, 230
Martin, W. A. P., 4, 7, 23, 27, 38, 47-8, 222, 224, 227
Mason, Mary Gertrude, 221
Mateer, Calvin W., 18, 19, 223
Mateer, Robert M., 248
Medhurst, W. H., 14, 220, 222
Milne, William, 13-14, 220
Miner, Luella, 133-34
Monroe, Paul, 82, 114, 115, 116, 124, 240
Morrison, Robert and Eliza, 2-3, 8, 12-13, 15, 40, 195, 219, 220, 221
Morse, W. R., 250
Mott, John R., 203
Moyer, R. T., 250

NOYES, H. V., 222

O'NEILL, F. W. S., 102-3, 228
Osborn, George, 245

PARKER, A. P., 23, 24, 25-6, 223, 225
Paton, David M., 205, 254
Patton, J. C., 97, 233
Peake, Cyrus, H., 72, 220, 225, 227, 233
Peet, L. B., 17, 222
Pilcher, L. W., 219, 220, 223, 225
Pius XI, Pope, 246
Porter, Lucius, 238
Poteat, Gordon, 182-83, 243, 250
Pott, F. L. Hawks, 35-6, 58, 82, 86, 114, 125, 134, 136, 179, 197, 230, 237, 241, 250. Also, "Report of the Publications Committee," 226-31
Pott, James H., 250
Preston, T. J., 226

Price, Frank Wilson, 149, 161, 169-72, 187, 191, 247, 248, 249, 252
Price, H. McC. E., 226

RANKIN, Marjorie, 252
Rawlinson, Frank, 156, 191
(Also, most editorials, *Chinese Recorder.*)
Redfern, H. S., 236
Rees, Ronald, 185, 245, 251
Reid, Gilbert, 23
Reynolds, Paul R., 155, 247
Ricci, Matteo, 8
Richard, Timothy, 5, 9, 23, 31, 90, 196, 219, 220, 221
Richardson, Miss H. L., 218
Rockhill, W. W., (U.S. Minister) 51-2, 229
Roots, Logan H., 197, 203
Ross, Ivan D., 243
Roxby, Percy M., 122
Ruggerius, Michael, 8
Runes, Dagobert D., 238
Russell, Bertrand, 70
Russell, Wm. F., 82, 122

SAILER, T. H. P., 82, 235
Sheffield, D. Z., 27, 44, 45, 221, 222, 225, 226-27, 230
Shryock, John K., 243
Shuck, Mrs. Henrietta, 15, 222
Silsby, J. A., 26, 47-8, 57, 58, 60-1, 80, 88, 95, 229, 231, 237
Simmons, E. Z., 195, 199, 253
Sites, C. M. L., 218
Smith, Arthur H., 66, 232
Snow, Edgar, 238
Spencer, Herbert; see Y. K. Yen
Steiger, Geo. Nye, 219
Stifler, Susan Reed, 220
Stowe, Everitt M., 187
Stuart, George A., 87, 93, 237
Stuart, J. Leighton, 75, 122, 123, 124, 134, 137, 150, 160, 191, 192, 203, 238, 245, 250, 251

TEWKSBURY, E. G., 58-9
Thorndike, Edward L., 82
Thurston, Matilda C. (Mrs. Lawrence), 122
Tuttle, Melsom S., 243

WALLACE, E. W., 122, 126, 128, 131, 132-33, 135-36, 139-41, 153, 157, 164-66, 174, 179, 243, 248, 250
Warnshuis, A. L., 145-46, 245
Weigle, Luther A., 186-87
Westman, Knut B., 169
White, F. J., 179
Wiant, Bliss, 204
Williams, E. T., 225
Williamson, Alexander, 20
Winans, E. J., 243
Woodbridge, S. I., 23, 90, 220, 254

II. *Easterners*

CHANG, C. S., 238
Chang Chih-tung, 7, 23, 24, 226
Chang Fu-liang, 153
Chang Hsueh-liang, 147
Chang, P. C., 234
Chang, Po-ling, 86, 122
Chang, T. Y., 236
Chao, T. C., 110, 134, 175, 178, 180-81, 184, 188, 204, 239, 247, 252
Chen, Mrs. C. C., 190, 251
Chen, Eugene, 141, 153-54
Chen, Sanford C. C., 37, 120, 126, 128, 129-30, 136, 137, 140, 157, 159, 163, 165, 178-79, 234, 239, 240, 242, 248

Chen Tu-hsiu, 71, 105, 108, 238
Chen, Y. G., 160, 234
Cheng Chien, 112
Cheng Ching-yi, 75, 106, 107, 137, 198
Chiang Kai-shek, 112-13, 138, 143, 144, 146-47, 150, 152, 157, 163, 201, 209, 252
Chiang, Madame (Soong Mei-ling), 148, 152, 245
Chiang Mon-lin, 172-74, 238, 249
Chiang, Peter, 160
Chih, C. C., 248
Chu You-kwang, 33, 115, 178, 226, 233, 240
Chuang Chia H., 178
Chung, W. K., 160

DING, Samson S., 185
Dsang, Lincoln, 160

FAN Yuan-lien, 70, 118-19, 127, 134, 178, 241
Fong F. Sec, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 87-8, 89, 90, 114, 121, 178, 182-83, 233, 234, 235, 236, 239

HARADA, J., 88, 226
Hsü, P. C., 100, 101-2, 119, 121, 127, 149, 238, 241, 245
Hu, C. P., 83
Hu, H. C., 232, 233
Hu Shih, 31, 68, 70, 71, 116-17, 132-33, 162, 180, 220-21, 232, 238, 243
Huang, J. L., 153
Huang, Quentin K. Y., 186, 250
Hung, William, 134, 178

K'ANG Yu-wei, 5, 6, 221
Kiang Wen-han, 150-52, 179, 180, 192, 246, 251, 252
King Chu, 136, 137, 234
Koo, T. Z., 108, 110, 170, 177, 178, 240
Ku Mong-yu, 245
Kung, Prince, 23
Kuo, P. W., 6, 15-16, 73, 75, 78, 86, 121, 122, 178, 219, 220, 224, 226, 227, 233

LAW Yau Tsit (Miss), 122
Lee, Baen E., 250
Lee, T. H., 121, 235
Lee, Y. C., 237
Lee, Y. L., 160, 164, 179
Leung, Geo. Kin, 161, 162, 189-90, 247, 252
Lew, Timothy Ting-fang (T. T.), 70-1, 110, 111, 136, 137, 154, 177, 179, 180, 186, 187, 204, 232-33, 237, 238, 239, 242, 243, 246, 250, 251-52, 253
Li Tien-lu, 159
Liang Chi-ch'ao, 5, 6, 221
Lin, C. J., 160
Lin P'u Ch'i, 243
Ling Chi Hong, 32, 226
Liu, Herman C. E., 160, 250
Liu Kwang-chao, 61
Liu, K. S., 238
Liu, Shuming T., 250
Lo Chen-yu, 28
Ly, J. U-sang, 250

MAO, Tze-tung, 238
Mei, H. C., 75
Mei, Y. P., 179, 250
Miao, Chester S., 134, 136, 169, 170, 171, 174, 179, 185, 187, 247, 248, 249, 252

SOONG, T. V., 148
Sun Fo, 208, 211, 253
Sun Yat-sen, 29-30, 66, 72, 111-12, 150, 152, 208, 209, 250
Sz Tsu-ping, 61

TAGAWA, D., 249
Tan, J. M., 205
Tao, W. T., 178, 189
Tong, Hollington K., 73, 233
Tong Kai-son, 38-9, 40, 202, 227, 228, 234

Ts'ai Yuan-pei, 70, 72, 178
Tsang, C. H., 178
Tsao, H. C., 159, 160, 163, 179, 240, 244, 245, 247
Tsao, S. K., 97-8, 235, 236
Tsen, Archie T. L., 235
Tseng Kuo-fan, 220
Tsen, P. Lindel, Preface, 168
Tsu, P. N., 61
Tsu, Andrew Y. Y., 75, 152, 238
Tsui Chi, 232, 246
Tu, Y. C., 179, 250

WANG Ching-wei, 112
Wang, C. T., 75, 106, 109, 239
Wang Hang-t'ung, 61
Wang Shih-chieh, 151
Wei, Francis C. M., 141, 157, 160, 175, 178, 179, 250
Wei, Sidney, 140-41
Wu Lei-chuan, 159
Wu Yi-fang, 160, 175, 250

YANG, Ernest Y. L., 204
Yang, Y. C., 160, 179, 237, 250
Yee, H. L., 99, 237
Yen, James, 153
Yen, Paul, 153
Yen, W. W., 54-5, 62, 223, 230
Yen, Y. K., 19, 61, 83, 223, 229, 235
Yie Pah Shou, 236
Yuan Shih-kai, 6, 27, 34, 37, 66, 72
Yui, David Z. T., 75, 121, 137, 153, 179
Yung Wing, 15, 220, 222, 227

ZAU Fong-yuin, 235
Zau, S. N., 235
Zen, Sophia H. Chen, 238
Zia Hang-lai, 61

III. *General Index*

"ADAPTABILITY," 205-6
Aggression
  economic, 208-9
  territorial, 2-3, 5-6, 206-7
Agrarian reforms, 208
Agriculture, 149
Air lines, 146-47
Altars, photographs of, 130
America, American; *see also* U. S.; Education
  7, 8, 12, 15, 51-3, 89, 166-67, 229
"Amateur educators," 78, 234
Amoy, 3, 145-46
Amsterdam Youth Conference, 205
Anglo-Chinese College, Malacca, 8, 13, 17, 195
Anglo-Chinese Wars, 3, 6-7, 221
Anhui, 147
Anking, 134, 184
Anti-Christian Movement, 103-4, 108-9, 153-54
  "Anti-Christian Education Movement," 241
  attacks Christian schools, 127-31, 242-43
  Hankow Government and, 140-42, 152-54, 157, 158, 244
  Nanking Government and, 163, 165, 249
  reasons for Christian schools, 174-76
  response of Chinese Christians to, 104-9, 111
  response of missionaries to, 108-11
  results of the attacks, 127-31, 131-37, 242-43
"Apologetic for China, The," 253
Autonomy, *see* Nationalist platform

"BATTLE of the Concessions," 3, 5-6, 207-8
Bible, 8, 13, 14, 26, 98, 105, 134, 191, 243
Blind and deaf, education of, 12
"Blue Books;" *see Ching Shih Wen*
"Boarding schools," 16-7

Book reviews, 7, 220, 224, 234, 235, 237
Boone, 75, 183, 222, 235
Boxer indemnity, ——— Movement, 3-4, 10, 31, 58, 102-3, 225
Buddhism, Buddhist, 7, 24, 47, 104-5, 167
Bureau of Foreign Affairs, 7

CAMBRIDGE, 21, 22, 70
Canton-Hankow railway, 227
Canton Missionary Association, 195
Capitalism, capitalist, 64, 69, 120, 130, 157, 247
Centenary Conference; *see* Protestant missionaries
Ch'in Shih Hwang-ti, 209
China-for-Christ Movement, 106
China Sunday School Union, 58-9
Chinese Christian Church
  and National Christian Council, 106
  and schools, 172ff., 249
  lack of prestige, 176, 187-89
  rural, 149-50, 186, 187, 201
Chinese Christian Movement, 75, 188
Chinese Christians,
  and government recognition, 90-1
  contribute to *Chinese Recorder,* 75, 110
  debarred from civil service, 50
  educated abroad, 75
  future of, 210-11, 248
  law suits, 40
  "Nationalism of a Chinese Christian," 253
  ostracized, persecuted, 10, 24-5, 39, 153-54
  patriotism, Patriotic Movement, 74-5, 101ff., 152-53
  "pick of all the countries," 248
  "rice Christians," 39
  statistics of, 9, 38, 41, 212-13
  status under Republic, 40, 153-4
  suspected, 8-9, 38-9
  "Worship of Confucius," 45, 90
Chinese clergy
  "Appeal from Chinese Educationists," 83-4, 90-1
  changes in, 74
  civil rights, 38-9
  "Difficulties of the Chinese Clergyman," 227
  employee status in missions, 40, 40-1, 63-4, 228
Chinese press; *see* Press
Chinese Recorder; see Bibliography
Ching Shih Wen, 13, 220-21
Chinshih, list of, 1906, 230
Christendom, 63, 204
Christian Literature Society; *see* Press
Christianity
  and imperialism, 153-54, 210-11
  and rural reconstruction, 148-50, 153, 246
  and Young People, 245
  defended by Reformers, 9, 220-21
  indigenization of, 105-9
  role of, 193, 203-5
Church; *see also* Chinese Christian Church; Denominations
  Children's Church, 184
  Czarist, 175
  "Inner Life of the Church," 251
  universal, world, 167, 188, 194, 204-5
Church Training School, Philadelphia, 234
Civilization, Chinese; *see also* Confucianism, Cultural imperialism, Education, New Civilization, Patriotism, Rationalism, Reform Movement, Religious liberty
  achievements under Kuomintang, Chap. IX
  agricultural, 6
  and totalitarianism, 209
  and Western civilization,

    - books, 7, 23, 24, 33, *see* New Civilization Movement
    - Chinese demand for, 20, 22, 31-3, 196-97
    - Hu Shih and, 68
    - industrialism, 68-9
    - introduction of, 4, 7, 13, 19
    - Japanese and, 25-6, 31-3
    - specialists in, 7
  - and world civilization, 118-19, 197, 207, 211
  - duty of revolution, 1
  - Jesuits and, 194, 221
  - "more Chinese" in 1930 decade, 180
  - Morrison and, 13, 195, 221
  - philosophy of history, 1-2
  - pride of, 194, 228
  - stability of, 1, 6
- Columbia University, 78
- Communism, Communist Party
  - alienate mission supporters, 166-67
  - and "capitalist" Christianity, 120, 157-58, 163, 247
  - and government education, 144, 162
  - and mission schools, 116, 120, 129-30, 165, 243, 247
  - and Nationalist patriots, 237, 239
  - and registration, 141-42
  - and students, 150-52, 180
  - and Three Principles, 209-10
  - and treaties, 153-54, 157-58, 166-7
  - Anti-Christian and Anti-Religion Movement, 103-4, 108-9, 153-54
  - "break of official power," 143
  - capture Kuomintang (Nationalist Party); *see* Hankow
  - entrenched in Kiangsi, 145, 147, 149-50
  - Hankow "Kuomintang" regime, 111-13, 140-43, 153-54, 157-58
  - Kiangsi evacuated, 147, 149
  - Kuomintang-Communist Rapprochement and Break, 111-13
  - Nationalist-Communist coalition, 131
  - Party organized, 103, 238
  - versus Young China Society, 129
- Confucius, Confucian, Confucianism; *see also* "Worship of Confucius"
  - basis of Chinese civilization, 179, 197, 209, 227
  - Classics, 6, 44, 225
  - deathblow to, 227, 228
  - "Jesus into a Confucius," 252
  - Neo-Confucianism, 104-5, 238
  - new schools and, 33, 38
  - Throne and, 53-4
- Co-operatives, 149
- Cosmopolitan Clubs, 76
- "Cultural aggression," or "invasion," 4, 109, 127-28, 162, 253

- DEMOCRACY, democratic ideals, 71, 106, 208-10, 254
  - economic, 208-9, 254
- Denominations and missions,
  - Anglican Communion *see below:* Church Missionary Society (British), American Church Mission (Protestant Episcopal), and *Chung Hwa Sheng Kung Hui*
  - Baptist, 4, 15, 28, 249
  - Basel Mission, 249
  - Brethren, Church of the, 249
  - China Inland Mission, 203
  - *Chung Hwa Sheng Kung Hui,* 152, 168-69, 185, 249
  - Church Missionary Society (Anglican), 19, 236
  - Church-of-Christ in China, 249
  - Congregational, 149, 170, 220, 222, 228

    Evangelical Church, 249
    London Missionary Society, 2, 12, 13, 183, 221
    Lutheran, 169, 249
    Methodist (or English Wesleyan), 4, 20, 23, 80, 87, 170, 183, 222, 228, 230, 249
    Presbyterian, 4, 18, 23, 26, 169, 249
    Protestant Episcopal, 75, 134, 183, 197, 222, 224, 228, 229
    Reformed Church in the U. S., 183
    Rhenish Missionary Society, 23, 249
    Sweden Missionary Society, Church of, 249
    United Church of West China, 249
Devolution, 135, 155-61, 166

EAST India Company, 2, 8, 12
Economic Council, National, 145, 148
Education, Chinese
    achievements of, 33ff., 71-4, 87-8, 113-15
    Americanization of, 115-16
    Anhui University, 147
    Auxiliary schools, 4
    Central Educational Commission, 140, 144, 162-63, 245
    Chi-nan-fu College, 27
    Christians in, 88, 121
    classical learning, 94
    "College for Diplomats," 4, 7
    compulsory, 162
    confiscation of temples, 24
    educational associations, 117, 120-21, 128, 131, 243
    Educational Commissions abroad, 7, 87, 220, 227
    eight-legged essay, 24, 224
    examination system, civil service, 6, 7, 32-4, 50, 54-5, 219, 230
    "Exhortation to Learning," 7, 23, 220
    experimentation, 72
    handicaps, 35, 36, 71-2, 77
    handwork of school children, 147
    Kiangnan Technical School, 28
    Ministry of Education (or Board of), 35-6, 51, 53, 88, 89, 91, 139, 151, 172-74
    missionary forerunners of, 111
    missionary education and, 114, 118-19, 233 (Note 1)
    Nankai University, 86
    national system,
        agitation for, 7-8
        "System of 1903," 8, 11, 30, 33-4
        "System of 1912," 72-3, 80
        "System of 1922," 92, 114-16
    National University of Peking, 5, 27, 70, 104, 115
    New Civilization Movement, and, 73-4, 114
    preparation for war, 37, 147
    provincial colleges, 72
    purpose of, 37-8, 54, 72-3, 115-16
    technical schools, 4
    traditional, 6-7
    transitional, 7, 226-27
    vocational emphasis, 73, 114, 127, 151
    westerners, and, 22-3, 24-5, 229
Education, Christian,
    Anglo-Chinese institutions, 20, 22
        neglect of Chinese in, 118, 119, 179-80
    China Christian Educational Association (CCEA)
        Advisory Council, 80-1, 134, 241
        budget, 126
        Chinese administrators, 159-60, 165-66, 170-71, 178-79
        Chinese journal, 36-7, 126
        Chinese leadership recognized, 110, 126-27, 242

  Chinese secretary, 36-7, 120
  Colleges and Universities, Association of, 126-27
    First College Conference, 127, 135, 170, 242
    Second College Conference, 127, 179
  Kuomintang, and, 158ff., 161, 200-1
  primary schools, 175-77, 187-88, 250, 252
  Provincial Boards, reorganization of, 123
  Regional Associations, rise of, 59, 231
    Central China Christian Educational Association, 79, 81, 123
    Chihli-Shansi Christian Educational Association, 123-24, 240
    East China Christian Educational Association, 79, 81, 98, 124, 126
    Fukien Christian Educational Association, 59, 81, 123
    Kwangtung (Canton) Christian Educational Association, 59, 79-80, 81, 231, 234-35
    Manchuria Christian Educational Association, 81
    Shantung-Honan Christian Educational Association, 79, 98
    West China Christian Educational Union, 59, 81, 92, 126
  registration issue; *see also* government recognition
  Borodin and, 141
  Committee on Government Relations, 124, 136-37
  compulsory religious exercises, 118-19, 123, 133-34, 136-37, 201, 243
  effects of, 161-67
  Kuomintang regulations, 139-40, 158, 159-60, 172
  Peking government regulations, 137-38, 139, 158, 159
  Nationalists and, 140-42
  religious liberty and, 167-76
  results of, to church, 185-88
    to education, 176-85
    to missionary role, 188-92
religious education, and
  Council on, 123, 134, 169
  improvement of, 134-35
  secretary (Chinese) for, 134
  survey of, 185
Secondary education, and,
  Chinese subjects poor, 118-19, 121, 179
  exotic character of, 117-19, 121ff.
  Hsü, P. C., evaluates, 121
  mergers, 177-78
  mission control of, 170
  new Chinese administrators, 170-71, 249
  regional associations and, 79-81

secularization of, 183-84
surpassed by government education
China Educational Commission; *see also* E. D. Burton
122-23, 124-25, 133-34, 242
Christian Colleges and Universities
incorporated as U. S. institutions, 86
secularization of, 248
Boone, 75, 183
Cheeloo (Shantung Christian College), 58, 62, 134, 159, 201, 246
Fukien Christian University, 160
Ginling College, 127, 160
Hua Chung (Central China College), 160, 183
Huping, 160
Lingnan (Canton Christian College), 149, 160, 223
Lutheran, 160, 248
Nanking University, 126, 149, 159, 201
St. John's University, 51, 61, 160, 163, 248
Soochow University, 86, 160, 237
University of Shanghai, 136, 160, 162, 182, 185, 232
West China Union University, 58, 158, 160, 236
Yali (Yale), 160
Yenching University, 58, 123, 134, 136, 160, 180, 181, 251
Day schools, 12, 16-17, 23, 42, 134, 221
Educational Association of China (EAC)
Appeal for Trained Educators, 46-7, Appendix B
budget, 56-8
Chinese participation in,
"Appeal from Chinese Educationists," 82-5, 90-1
authors of textbooks, 19, 61, 231
Chinese Recorder, 75, 110, 178, 239
Educational Review, 178-79, 189
first Chinese on program, 88-90
limited Chinese membership, 43, 56, 235-36
status of Chinese teachers, 61-4, 93-5
government recognition
"Chinese Educationists" and, 90-1
Anderson, D. L., and, 86-7, 89
Bowen, A. J., and, 95-6
Bryan, R. T., and, 90
Fong F. Sec and, 88-9
Pott, F. L. H., and, 86, 230
graduates disfranchised, 90-1, 96
headquarters needed, 56-7
missionary role in,
administrators, 231
agitators for national system, 25
Appeal to Mission Boards, 45-6, Appendix B
authors of textbooks, 59-60, 231
"beneficent schemes," 27
challenged,
Anderson, D. L., 93-5
Chinese, 96-9

        competition from Japanese, 25-6
        develop system of mission schools, 42-7, 55-9
        English, teachers of, 59, 223
        Examination Scheme, 20-1, 24-5, 224
        finances, control of, 63, 97, 98
        Jackson, James, and, 22
        organizers of EAC, 20-2
        regional associations, organizers of, 59
        religious liberty, defenders of; *see* Worship of Confucius
        specialists in Western learning, 28, 46-7
        standardization, 20-2, 64, 224
        train Chinese clergy, 22
    Publications Committee, 21-2, 59-60, 61, 231
    relationships with Chinese government; *see also* government recognition
        Extraterritoriality, 53, 77, 86
        Fourth Triennial, frustration, 43-8
        Fifth Triennial, 48-50
        Sixth Triennial, sympathetic, 86-91
    statistics, 43, 56, 83, 85
    secretary of,
        Gamewell, Frank D., 80
        Silsby, J. A., 80
    Triennials
        First, 56, 83
        Second, 23, 56, 83
        Third, 24, 56, 83
        Fourth, 27, 43, 48, 55, 56, 83, 196, 224, 226, 229, 231
        Fifth, 33, 43, 48, 56, 83, 88, 114, 226, 229
        Sixth, 43, 48, 55, 56, 57, 58, 83, 86-91, 93, 95, 198, 204, 231, 235, 236
        Seventh, 22, 80, 93, 235
    union work; *see also* Mission Boards, Regional Associations
        Centenary Conference resolutions, 55-8
        hampered by lack of funds, 36-7, 56-8
        Union University, 58, 230
Mission Boards and,
    Appeal to the Boards, 46-48, Appendix B
    budget, 57-8, 85
    Centenary Conference resolutions, 55-6
    hamper union work, 79, 85
    Martin, Dr. W. A. P., and "Appeal," 47-8
    Methodist, 80
    Presbyterian, 80
    replies from the Boards, 218
    "secular" education, 18, 222
    send teachers, 42-3, 177-78, 192
mission funds, control of, 95, 97, 98
mission institutions; *see also* CCEA, EAC, *et al*
    Anglo-Chinese College, Malacca, 8, 12-3, 17, 195
    "Boarding schools," 16-8
    charity schools, 13-15, 221
    curriculum, 13-5, 59, 79-80, 88, 91, 93, 94
        acceptance of government c., 123
    extraterritoriality, harmed by, 132

      - protected by,77,86,112
    - girls and women, 16-17
    - handicaps of, 100, 121
    - Kuo, P. W., on early schools, 15-6
    - "models," 87
    - "Place of Foreigner in," 124, 252
    - purpose of, 17, 138, 139, 244
    - rural departments in, 201-2
    - school principal problem, 97-9, 100, 121-22
    - secularization of, 183-84, 191, 246, 250
  - Protestant missionaries and,
    - forerunners of the national system 15-6, 22-6
    - influenced by Chinese government, 18-9
    - Nationalist Platform, 133
  - School and Textbook Committee, 11, 18, 21
  - statistics, 16, 17, 35, 77-8, 116, 170, 176-77, 184
  - "Worship" of Confucius issue,
    - Chinese Educationists, 90-1
    - Fourth Triennial and, 43ff., 228
    - Martin-Silsby controversy, 47-8
    - old law revived, 38
    - Manchus and, 53-4
    - Shantung ruling, 27
    - teachers and, 232
- Educational autonomy, 28, 133, 180, 210
- Educational Prerogatives, recovery of, 225
- Elementary School Act, 222
- Emperor, *Ch'ien Lung*, 195, 221, 253
  - *Kwang Hsü*, 5, 6, 7, 24, 199, 219, 225
- Empress Dowager, *Tzu Hsi*, 3, 6, 9-10, 24, 25, 26, 31, 219, 225
- English,
  - articles on, 12, 23, 222, 223, 231
  - demand for, 20, 22, 26, 28, 29, 55, 219
  - French Fathers and, 225
  - missionaries and, 15, 22
- evangelistic work, 18, 22
- extraterritoriality,
  - abrogation of, 207-8
  - and education, 53, 86, 230

- FACT Finders' Reports, 205-6, 251, 252, 254
- Farmers' Bank, 201
- Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 235
- "Four Centuries of Confusion," 1
- Free trade, 3

- GERMANY, German, 3, 23, 27, 203
- "Government and Missionary Education in China," 233, 234
- "Government Education," 178, 239
- Great Britain, 2, 3, 6-7, 221
- *Great Century, The*, 233
- Guild, 39

- HANLIN, 5, 9
- Harvard-Yenching Institute of Chinese Studies, 198, 253
- Health, Ministry of, 145
- Hongkong, 3, 15, 17, 207
- Hunan, 79, 142, 238
- Hymns, 111, 187, 204-5

- IMPERIAL Metropolitan Examinations; *see* W. W. Yen
- Indigenous, indigenization,
  - articles in *Chinese Recorder*, 109-10
  - C. T. Wang uses, 105-6
  - Christianity to be indigenized, 105-9, 238
  - colleges, 126-27
  - Educational Commission, 121-23
  - schools, 121-27, 135
- Industrial program planned, 208

Institute for Social and Religious Research, 37, 126
Interdenominational, *see* union

JAPAN,
  Anti-Japanese Save-the-Country Association, 145
  books for China, 32-3
  Chinese Christians, accuses, 104-5
  Formosa, 3
  "Incidents," 146
  Korea, 3, 5, 7
  Manchuria, 128, 145
  National Salvation Movement, 152
  North China invasion, 251
  Russia defeated, 7, 32
  Shanghai war, 145
  Shantung invaded, 67, 99, 203
  students to, 30, 32, 150, 236
  "Twenty-one Demands," 67, 103, 232
Jerusalem Conference, IMC, 159
Jesus, 105, 252
Jesuits, *see* Roman Catholics
"Jobless Graduates," 150-51, 246

KUOMINTANG, Nationalists (People's Party)
  66, 110-13, 139-42, 143-54, 157-59, 160, 161-63, 167, 180, 181-96, 199ff., 203, 209-10, 244, 245

LA JEUNNESE, 70, 71, 73, 100
Landlord-tenant relationships, 202
Lao-tzu, 209
Law courts, 39, 227-28
Lay Training Movement, 187
Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, Fact Finders' Reports, 191, 206, 251, 252, 254
League of Nations, 148, 178
Lichwan Experiment, 245
Literati, 223

MADRAS SERIES, 250-51
Malacca, 8, 13, 14, 17, 195, 222
Manchu Court, or Dynasty (Ch'ing)
  abolish Examinations, 34
  and literacy, 233
  and "new schools," 33-4, 36, 37-8
  and "Reform," 26, 29, 30
  bulwark in Confucianism, 53-4
  dynasty, 1-2, 199, 202, 219
  flight of court, 4, 25
  last days, 65-6
  officials, 9
  peak of rule, 195, 221
  restored to power, 25, 27
Mass migration, 146
Medical vocabulary; *see* Terminology
Memorials
  Fifth Triennials, 48-50
  Protestant Missionaries, 220
  Yuan Shih K'ai, 34
Mexico, 253
Ming dynasty, 1, 194-95
Mission funds, control of, 62-3, 97, 98
Missionaries
  and "indigenization of Christianity," 239
  and interference in government affairs, 49-50
  attacked by U. S. secular press, 225
  criticized by Chinese students, 200, 252 (Note 97)
  evacuated by consular orders, 142, 197, 199
  ideal, 198
  killed, 153, 199, 220, 246, 253
  limitations, 22
  purveyors of superstitions, 104-5
  regarded as enemies of mankind, 9, 199; as paid agents, 8-9, 161, 199
  statistics, 4, 9, 43, 77-8, 85, 109, 156, 191, Appendix A

    tendency to engage in institutional work, 191, 252
    welcomed, 189-90, 191-92, 193-94
    younger, 76, 233-34
Missionary "Assistants," or "Helpers," 17, 231-32
Mohammedans, 128
Morrison Education Society, 15, 222

NANKING
    government university, 5
    Incident, 113, 143
    Southeastern University, 27, 70, 104
    Theological Seminary, 149
    Treaty of, 3
National Assembly, 65-6
National Christian Council, 106, 132, 148, 153, 185
National Committee for Christian Religious Education, (NCCRE)
    activities, 186-87
    Chinese leadership, 187
    Origin, 185-86
    Religious Education Movement, 187
National Salvation Movement, 152
Nationalism, 102-3, 116, 117-19
    "Nationalists" of 1927, 151
    Nationalists and Christianity, 153-54, 201-2
    Nationalist-Communist coalition, 128, 131, 167
    Nationalist platform, 133
    Young China Party, 105, 129, 130
Neo-Confucianism, 104-5, 238
New Civilization Movement, 197-98
    merged with Patriotic Movement, 100-1
    new poetry, 68-9
    sources of, 70-1
    stimulus to Christian group, 104-9
    stimulus to education, 73
New Life Movement, 149
North China Daily News, 249

OBERLIN, 210
Oxford University, 21, 22

PAI HUA, 71
Patriot, patriotism, 240
Patriotic Movement, 67, 99-100, 101-3, 104-5, 119
Peking, 66, 158
    Protocol of, 4
    Relief of Legations at, 22
    University of, 5, 70
Peking Apologetic Group, 107-8, 238
"Petition of the Chinese Churches," 172, 249
Photographs in *Educational Review*
    altars, 130
    new college presidents, 247
    new middle school principals, 247
Press
    Chinese press, 71, 75, 101, 108, 219, 237
    Christian Literature Society, 20
    Commercial Press, 60, 87-8, 136, 234, 235, 236
    Kiangnan Arsenal Press, 19, 223
    Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge, 20
    T'ung Wen Kuan Press, 7
Propaganda, importance of, 144
Protestant Christianity,
    and imperialism, 153-54, 166-67
    and New Life Movement, 150
    and Rural Reconstruction, 149, 201
    "Antagonisms against the Missionary: Is this . . . a Foreigner?" 253
    entrance into China, 8
    Modernist-Fundamentalist controversy, 109-11

  persecuted, 9-10, 38-40, 153-54, 156-57, 199, 220, 246, 253
  "Protestant Captives and Martyrs," 246
  trained Chinese ministry needed, 22
Protestant Missionaries, General Conference of, 1877, 18-20, 223
Protestant Missionaries, General Conference of, 1890, 20-1, 60, 220-21, 223
Protestant Missionaries, Centennial, 1907, 41, 55, 57-8, 85, 226, 228, 230

RACE, racial pride, 40, 61-4, 74-6, 94-5, 96-7, 99, 125-26, 185-86, 195-96, 201-3, 204-5, 206, 228, 231-32, 233-34, 251, 253-54
Rationalism, 105, 116-17, 132-33, 238
Reform Movement
  and education, 7
  and missionary education, 25, 44
  counter-revolution, 9-10
  Christianity defended, 9, 220-21
  Hanlin Reform Society, 5
  missionaries and, 199, 201, 225
  "One Hundred Days of Reform," 5, 24
Religious Education
  All China Conference, 185-86, 203, 251
  articles on, 135
  Chinese leadership, 187
  church-centered, 175-76, 184, 186-87
  Council of, 123, 134, 169
  driven from school, 188
  missionaries desired in, 191-92
  qualitative improvement of, 134ff.
  significance of, 175-76, 186-87
  survey of, 185
  tsung chiao chiao yu
  Yenta Fellowship
Religious Education Fellowship, 186-87
Religious instruction,
  compulsory, 118-19, 123, 133-34, 201, 243
  forbidden below senior middle school, 171ff., 201
  Morrison and, 13
Religious liberty,
  group, 168-69, 253
  individual, 124, 163-65, 166ff., 249-50
  institutional, 93, 124, 163-65, 166ff.
  "Petition of the Chinese Churches," 172, 249-50
  Chiang Mon-lin's Reply, 172-74
"Religious Life in the Colleges," 240
Renaissance; *see* New Civilization Movement
Republic,
  and educational autonomy, 92
  disasters and achievements, 144ff., 245, Note 11
  early years, 103
Review of the Times, (Wan Kuo Kung Pao), 5
Revolution of 1911; *see also* Sun Yat-sen
  29-30, 36, 55, 65-6
Roman Catholics
  "Catholic Native Episcopacy," 246
  enter China, 8, 194
  Father Paschal D'Elia, S. J., 246
  Fides, 246
  Jesuit writings, 221
  lumped with Protestants, 118
  oppose entrance of Protestants, 8, 220
  persecuted, 153, 246
  The Rock, 246
  Vicariate of Ichang, 246
Romanization, 55, 60-1
Rural Reconstruction, Commission on, 145, 201
Rural Reconstruction Movement, 148ff.

Russia, Russians; *see also* Borodin, Communism
    anti-Christian bias, 175
    Anti-Christian Movement, 109, 237, 239, 240
    "Battle of Concessions," 3
    early contacts, 4
    "imperialism," 253
    literature, 71, 152
    return to Russia, 143
    Three Principles, 209-10
Russo-Japanese war, 32, 34

SALARIES, 62-4, 79-80, 98, 228, 232, 234
Science
    and religion, 104-5, 107-8
    as *yung*, 44, 228
    demand for, 20, 223
    introduction of, 7, 13, 219
    scientific treatises, 19-20
    social sciences, 152, 180, 246
    terminology, 21, 88, 90, 223
Shanghai, 3, 4, 102, 104, 145, 156, 220, 238
Sian incident, 147-48
"South China Journal," 53
"Spheres of influence," 5, 207, 211
Students
    articles on, 12, 102-3
    in Japan, 7, 30, 32, 150, 226
    Leftist trend, 180
    National Students' Union, 102, 144, 245
    New Civilization Movement, 69-71
    New Life Movement, 150
    "Returned Student in China," 233
    Student Unrest, 150-52
    West, 7, 54-5, 65-6, 69-71, 220, 229, 230
Sung Chen College, 18

TAOISM, Taoist, 7
Teachers College, 234
Theological schools, 16-7
"Three Principles," 210
Toleration clauses, 3, 8
Toronto University of, 174
Trained ministry, 22
Treaty, treaty protection
    abrogated, 193, 208
    agitation against, 130, 132
    call for revision, 130-32, 200
    Chinese Recorder and, 132, 168
    Chinese scorn of, 199
    Educational Review and, 132, 200
    handicap, 132
    legacy of, 167
    of Nanking, 3
    of Shimonosaki, 11
    of Tientsin, 3, 8, 11
    ports, 3, 7-8, 15
Treaty port relationships, 40, 195-96, 202-3, 233-34, 253, 254
Tsungli Yamen, 224

UNITED States
    "Chinese Exclusion," 167, 225
    loan from, 148
    Minister, W. W. Rockhill
    secular press, 167, 225
    universities incorporated, 86

WESTERN aggressiveness, 2, 68
Western business interests, 208-10
Western Christians alienated, 166-67, 210ff.
"Why I Have Not Become a Christian," 252
Women, 16-7, 32, 58, 75
World's Chinese Students' Journal, 226
World-mindedness, 211
World Student Christian Federation, 103, 120, 210
World Sunday School Association, 185, 186
World War I, 67-8, 116, 203
Worship, 134, 149, 171, 172, 175-76, 188, 251-52

YALE University, 15, 153, 222, 227
Yangtze Valley Flood, 145
Yenta Fellowship, 180-81
Young China Society, 119, 120, 129
Young Men's Christian Association, 40-1, 76, 121, 150, 153, 163, 179, 192, 232

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For permission to re-print copyrighted material acknowledgment is hereby given to the following persons and publishers:

Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, for permission to quote from *The Chinese System of Public Education* (Contribution to Education #64), by P'ing Wen Kuo.

E. P. Dutton, for permission to quote from *Letters From China and Japan* by John and Alice Dewey.

International Missionary Council, for permission to quote from *The Madras Series, Vol. IV*.

Prof. Harley Farnsworth MacNair, for permission to quote from *Far Eastern International Relations* by Hosea Ballou Morse and Harley Farnsworth MacNair.

Date Due

[redacted]
N 16 '48
N 17 '48
FACULTY
OC 21 '55
NO 4
NO 16 '55
JAN 31 '56
APR 27 '56
[redacted]
~~MAR 93~~
[redacted]
FEB 15 1991
JAN 2 1997
JAN 31 1997
APR 12 1997
FEB 24 1997
[redacted]
AUG 1993

7.45

7.116

LC626 .C6G81
China and educational autonomy;
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00026 4491